

CHURCH AND SOCIETY IN THE ELEVENTH AND TWELFTH
CENTURIES : EASTERN INFLUENCE ON WESTERN MONASTICISM
- THE CASE OF STEPHEN OF MURET -

Presented by
Marilyn Dunn
for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

University of Edinburgh

September 1981



CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract of Thesis	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
General Introduction	1-2
 <u>Part I</u>	
A. Introduction	3-9
B. (i) The Evolution of the New Monastic Orders	9-17
(ii) Contemporary critics and their value	17-23
(iii) Other views of the new orders	23-32
C. (i) Origins of the New Monastic Orders	32-36
(ii) Cluny and decadence	36-43
(iii) John of Matera	43-46
D. Recent developments in historical research	46-49
E. Orthodox influence - the theory	49-51
Notes to Part I	52-66
 <u>Part II</u>	
A. Introduction	67-68
B. (i) The <u>Life</u> and the historians : early printed versions and commentators	68-69
(ii) The <u>Life</u> and the historians : the Bollandists	70-71
(iii) The <u>Life</u> and the historians : the Maurists	72-76
(iv) The <u>Life</u> and the historians : Becquet and his predecessors	76-85
C. The problem of Milo of Benevento	85
(i) Milo as Saint	85-88
(ii) Milo Dean of Paris	88-100
(iii) The Italian evidence for Milo of Benevento	101-133
Notes to Part II	134-161
 <u>Part III</u>	
A. Introduction	162
B. The <u>Life</u> of Stephen : Background and Structure	162-175
C. The <u>Liber de Doctrina</u>	175-201
D. Local models for Stephen and Grandmont	201-210
E. Conclusion	210-220
Notes to Part III	221-238

List of Abbreviations	Page 239-240
Primary Sources Cited in the Text	241-243
Secondary Works Cited in the Text	244-254
Addenda and Corrigenda	255

ABSTRACT OF THESIS

Name of Candidate. Dunn, Marilyn

Address. 35 Barony Street, Edinburgh EH3 6NX

Degree. PhD

Date. September 1981

Title of Thesis. Church and Society in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries:
Eastern Influence on Western Monasticism - the Case of Stephen of Muret.

The rise of the new religious orders of the eleventh and twelfth centuries has been ascribed to a variety of factors, and we are still largely in the process of determining the relationship of the changes in monasticism to the society, economy and spirituality of the period. Certain assumptions, however, still tend to underly our thinking on the rise of the new orders - the best known of these being the theory which equates their emergence with a revolt against the decadence of traditional Benedictinism. This thesis seeks to demonstrate, by way of introduction, that this idea cannot be sustained, either in its own terms or in the light of recent work. The major part of the thesis is concerned with the question of the existence of eastern (and in particular Italo-Greek) influence on western monasticism, a theory which has been given additional credibility by recent work on the Life of Stephen of Muret, the founder of the Order of Grandmont. Stephen, a native of the Auvergne, is supposed to have visited southern Italy in his youth and spent several years with an archbishop of Benevento who was an ardent admirer of a group of Calabrian religious who lived lives of great austerity. Inspired by their way of life, Stephen obtained permission to found an order and, returning to France, established himself as a hermit in the Limousin where he lived for about fifty years, eventually with a few disciples who formed the nucleus of the future Order of Grandmont. The second part of this thesis re-examines the evidence of the Life and its recent re-habilitation and seeks to demonstrate that neither the evidence nor its apparent confirmation by a succession of historians can be upheld as reliable. Part Three examines not only the circumstances of the composition of the Life but also the religious life of the Limousin and the earliest expression of Grandmontine spirituality which indicate the relationship of the order not to some remote exemplar, but to the society and spirituality of France in the twelfth century, finally suggesting the difficulties and contradictions inherent in any theory of Byzantine influence on western monastic movements at this period.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is my very pleasant duty to begin these acknowledgements by thanking the British School at Rome for the financial generosity which allowed me to carry out research in Rome and southern Italy in the autumn of 1977.

While it is customary to begin personal acknowledgements by thanking one's supervisor, my thanks to my original supervisor, Derek Baker, are more than customary: to him I owe an inexpressible debt of gratitude for his erudition, perspicacity, and generosity in carrying out what must often have seemed a peculiarly thankless task. To Dr. Michael Angold of the Edinburgh History Department, who eventually assumed Derek's burden, I am also indebted for his kindness and patience. Thanks are due also to Dr. Gary Dickson who has contributed some most helpful comments on the problems of tracing saints' cults; and Mr Richard Rose has proved a tireless listener to and avid discussor of many of the problems which confronted me - for which I am most grateful. To my own department at Glasgow, too, my thanks for their support, especially to Professor A. L. Brown whose interest and encouragement helped me finish this work.

The multiplication of forms of the religious life in the eleventh and twelfth centuries poses - and will continue to pose, for some time to come - a variety of questions for the historian. Apart from the necessity of determining the individual fortunes of the seemingly innumerable new houses and of examining in detail the history of the variety of new orders and congregations which sprung up between the times of Romuald of Ravenna and Francis of Assisi, a formidable array of broader problems arises. The rise of forms of monasticism which differed - to whatever degree - from the traditional Benedictinism of the period raises the questions of their relationship to the changes which were taking place in the economy and society of the time; to the reform movement within the papacy itself; and particularly to the apparent growth of heresy and religious dissent in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. This was a period of social, ecclesiastical and spiritual change: and the position of the 'new' orders, lying as it does at the crossroads of these changes is still being elucidated.

Views of monasticism are of course, constantly changing - the reevaluation of texts such as the Regula Magistri and the earliest Cistercian documents has contributed in the last few decades to the emergence of a new approach to the monastic history of the periods in which they were composed. There is, however, no doubt that, particularly in the case of the rise of the 'new' orders of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, certain traditional views still persist. That they do is a testimony not only to the complexity of the monastic world of the time but also to that of the society from which it emerged. The rise of Cîteaux and the other orders of the period has been traditionally identified with a reaction against a process of secularisation which supposedly had the Benedictines, and particularly the Cluniacs, in its grip - a process of secularisation and reaction which finds a parallel in, and was perhaps partly suggested by, the revolt against secular domination by the eleventh-century papacy. The aim of this thesis is to demonstrate, by way of introduction, that even the most forceful expression of this theory of decline followed by reaction cannot be sustained - either in its own terms or in view of recent work on the subject. But this assumption is far from being the only one

underlying thinking on the 'new' orders, and the major part of the thesis will concentrate on the question of Byzantine influence on the monastic developments of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. The ascetic spirituality and frequent eremitical bias of the newer forms of monasticism has suggested to some historians some connection between them and Byzantine monasticism, and this view has been given additional credibility in recent years, not only by the study of contacts between east and west in the tenth and eleventh centuries but also by examination of the case of the Order of Grandmont and of its 'founder' Stephen of Muret. The Life of Stephen tells us that his austerity, his life as a hermit, and even his desire to found an order was inspired by a period spent in southern Italy in which he came to know of a Calabrian congregation which lived a life of great austerity. This thesis seeks to demonstrate that, contrary to recent findings, the evidence of the Life of Stephen is unreliable and its assertions cannot be confirmed from other sources and also that Stephen's social and spiritual orientation - little if at all studied - reveals his relationship to the society of southern France and to the spirituality characteristic of much of the religious life of northern Europe in the twelfth century.

PART I

A. INTRODUCTION

To the non-specialist approaching for the first time the history of monasticism in the eleventh and twelfth century, certain areas already stand out, at least by reputation. The forceful spirituality of St Bernard is familiar; the name of Peter Damian is also well-known although perhaps to a lesser degree; and the names of the most prominent of the new orders, the Cistercians, Carthusians, and Premonstratensians are impressed upon our consciousness. For those wishing to venture beyond this elementary level, a fair amount of work on the new orders has appeared in the last thirty or so years. Various historians have, so to speak, measured out their own spheres of influence. Dom Jean Becquet of the abbey of Ligugé has written extensively on the order of Grandmont, its founder Stephen of Muret and his association with southern Italy and the hermits of Calabria, and also on the early statutes, literature, and history of the order¹. The one intrusion into Becquet's territory was made by the distinguished Belgian historian, Father Charles Dereine with a piece on the earliest Grandmontine obituary²; and Dereine has made other important contributions to our knowledge of the period with his work on the origins of Prémontré and on the Austin canons and Afflighem³. The Carthusians have been the subject of researches by Bligny, de Meyr and de Smet⁴; while the early history of Cîteaux has been investigated by Mahn, Turk, Leclercq, Lefevre, Werner and Folz⁵. Dickinson's Origins of the Austin Canons appeared in 1950⁶; and the spirituality of those other heralds of the new orders, Peter Damian and Romuald of Ravenna has recently been the object of several studies⁷.

The new monastic movement as such has been the subject of more general surveys. The topic of eremiticism and its influence in the religious life was the subject of a conference at La Mendola in 1962⁸. Grundmann's new edition of Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter contains a survey of the new orders which he associates with the other prominent 'religious movements' of the period, heresies and marginal movements with their emphasis on poverty⁹. Werner's Pauperes Christi is similarly concerned with the relationship between the mainstream monastic movements and those which verged on or embraced the heretical: he emphasises, in addition, the economic and social background to the eremitical movements of north-western France, and the almost

simultaneous appearance of the papal movement for the reform of the church¹⁰. Chenu, writing from a standpoint fundamentally different from that of the Marxist Werner has drawn our attention, in two important studies, to what he considers to be the most important aspects of developments in theology and philosophy in the eleventh and twelfth centuries: the influence of the gospel and the consequent desire in the monastic body to return to the vita apostolica, the communal life of the primitive church - whether this was a myth or, as Chenu affirms, a model¹¹. Perhaps best known of all is the work of Jean Leclercq, whose essay on 'The monastic crisis of the eleventh and twelfth century' points to a spiritual decline - caused by wealth and worldly involvement - in the great Benedictine houses of the time such as Cluny. Leclercq simply sees in the appearance of the new orders a reaction against decadence which was spreading like a cancer through the body of traditional Benedictinism¹².

How clear a picture of the pattern of monastic developments in the eleventh and twelfth centuries emerges from the work of these and earlier historians? If we except from consideration, for the moment, the work of Leclercq, our picture is an interesting one although not without its confusions and contradictions. A great deal of valuable detail concerning individual founders, houses, and even orders has, naturally, emerged. The figure of Bernard of Clairvaux, by reason of his writings, stands out in even sharper relief. Peter Damian is slightly less well-defined in our minds, and one suspects that he owes even this position largely to the fact that he played an important role in the reform movement associated with Gregory VII, although his association with Romuald of Ravenna and his beliefs about the place of the monk in society have been discussed of late. Behind these two figures are men of the calibre of Robert of Arbrissel, Bernard of Tiron and Stephen of Muret. We learn that Stephen was so fervent in his prostrations that callouses grew on his knees - 'like a camel' - and his nose curved sideways. The borders of Maine, Anjou and Brittany, to which Bernard at one stage fled, were so peopled by hermits that the area became known as a second Egypt which looked spiritually to principes et magistri such as Robert of Arbrissel and Peter de Stella¹³. Women too participated in this movement: witness the provision made for them by Robert of Arbrissel in the double house

at Fontevrault¹⁴.

The Vallombrosans and Carthusians are famous for their semi-solitary and silent existence; the Cistercians for their devotion to the message of the 'whole Gospel' and for the severity of their primitive legislation which forbade ostentation or the acceptance of tithes, the fruit of the labour of other men¹⁵. The Premonstratensians, apparently under the influence of Bernard, adopted many Cistercian customs. The Grandmontines, in the name of their founder Stephen of Muret affirmed that 'There is no other Rule save the Gospel!': so harsh were their precepts that even Gerald of Wales, who was later to prove a severe critic of the English Grandmontine houses, felt compelled to admit that their original statutes were too severe¹⁶. The architecture of the new monasteries reflected the moving spirits behind them: in the Apologia, Bernard condemned what was for him the uncleanness of Romanesque ornamentation and thus helped clear the way for the Gothic; and the individual cells arranged round a cloister indicate the Carthusian desire for solitary contemplation, broken only by meetings at daily and weekly worship. The liturgy of the new orders was often similarly spare.

But how clearly defined are the impulses which produced and nurtured these phenomena? Which social classes and social movements were involved in them? How closely were they related to the feudal order? And what precisely were their connections with the papal reform movement of the eleventh century and with the heresies of the twelfth? These questions can still be asked with no loss of face by the serious student of monasticism as well as by the beginner in the field¹⁷. The reasons for this lie partly in the often fragmentary approach to the question - writers have tended to concentrate on the history of one house or order rather than aim for a more general perspective. And the studies which in fact attempt this broader view cannot answer all these important questions.

The main achievement of Chenu lies in his definition of the vita apostolica as a return to the precepts of the Gospel which embraced the monastic life but which originally excluded the tasks of proselytizing and preaching which we would understand as part of the apostolic life: according to his analysis, the monastic world comprehended only the communal element in the doctrine. Later would follow an

'evangelical awakening' which would emphasise the task of preaching, particularly in the cities, and deprive traditional monasticism of its primacy. But Chenu apparently rejects the notion that the adoption of the vita apostolica could have had social impulses at its root; and although strong on the concept of poverty in the vita apostolica he does not deal with its practical implications for individual houses and orders. Chenu is writing from a theological and philosophical standpoint - a fact which is even more strongly underlined in the French original than in the English translation of his essays - and cannot realistically be expected to concern himself with such questions¹⁸.

Werner and Grundmann have both suggested partial answers to our second question - that of the social basis of the monastic movement - although they are both primarily concerned with heresy. Nevertheless, they also treat monasticism in association with this topic. Grundmann indicates that many of his heretical movements were led, not by the poor, who often provided the mass basis, but by members of the lesser aristocracy or bourgeoisie¹⁹. The same, presumably, could apply to the new orders: we need only think of the parents of Bernard of Clairvaux or Stephen of Muret, both representatives of the lesser nobility²⁰. Werner, on the other hand, indicates the geographical, social, and economic advantages of the 'new Egypt' in north-western France. And both stress the connection between the new orders and heresies in the shared concept of 'apostolic poverty'²¹.

Yet, although the connections between the 'new' orders and the economy, society, and spirituality of their era are still in the process of emerging a certain relaxation or complacency has perhaps of late crept into our approach to the new orders. Leclercq has recently been quoted as declaring that:

The masters of the spiritual life, the authors of treatises and the legislators, tell us what the monastic life ought to be. To tell us what it was actually like it is necessary to question authors whose works have not merited publication, lacking the exceptional qualities proper to great works of literature and doctrine but which are nevertheless instructive about the mentality of their world²².

Superficially, this might appear to be a plea for more detailed research which might indeed help us to know the movement and the period better; but Leclercq's fundamental assumptions in making this statement are much more sweeping. He evidently believes that we possess a reasonably clear picture of monastic aims and impulses at this period and, as I have attempted to indicate, this is not necessarily the case.

But Leclercq himself has particularly good reason to suppose that the impulses which lay behind the emergence of the new orders have been amply explored. In his article on 'The monastic crisis of the eleventh and twelfth century' he traces a 'crisis of prosperity' in the great Benedictine houses of the eleventh century, and offers textual evidence both for this and for the revolt against their wealth and moral decline which he believes precipitated the formation of the new monastic orders. He sees, in addition to this, a similar 'crisis of prosperity' in the twelfth century, when the Cistercians and others fell into the wealth trap which had ensnared the monks of Cluny, Farfa, Gorze, and Monte Cassino in the preceding century.

Despite some recent demonstrations of unease concerning its premises²³, 'The monastic crisis' has dominated discussion of the new orders since its appearance in 1958. Leclercq's erudition is well known and his pioneering spirit admirable; and his conclusions have the added attraction of providing a blanket solution to the fundamental question 'Why?' And even had he not written 'The monastic crisis', Leclercq might still have felt partly justified in issuing his call for an investigation of the lesser works of the period. If the notion of a 'crisis of prosperity' has dominated discussion of the new orders for the last twenty years, another concept has steadily infiltrated this discussion to such an extent that virtually every writer on the subject mentions it. Especially since the appearance (from the early 1950s on) of the work of Becquet on the Order of Grandmont, it has generally been accepted that the new orders may have drawn a significant part of their inspiration from the influence of Orthodox spirituality - more precisely, that of the Greek-Italian monks of Calabria²⁴.

Nevertheless, despite the enthusiasm with which these two approaches to the new orders have been taken up, or at least discussed, our knowledge of the movement is still far from secure. If I may offer a tentative definition of a myth in historiographical terms as a conclusion based on insufficient consideration or insufficient knowledge; a detaching of facts or events from their historical context; and the emergence of a mistaken or over-simplified point of view - then current assumptions on the impulses behind the emergence of the new orders verge on the mythical. And while un-concerted or partial approaches to the question have rendered it in some degree inaccessible to

beginner and enthusiast alike, it is the myths surrounding the new orders which have obscured our view most of all.

Perhaps the most potent myth of all is expressed by Leclercq when he declares himself ready to tackle the history of the new orders in its minor aspects: the belief that most of the significant ground has been covered is shared by a number of historians. The essential concern of this thesis, however, is with the myth of southern Italian influence and the problem of the supposed connection between the Order of Grandmont and the 'hermits of Calabria' who are commonly considered to have provided the spiritual inspiration for its founder Stephen of Muret (d 1124)²⁵. The central section of the thesis is taken up by an examination of the evidence associating Stephen with southern Italy and with the account given in his Life of his journey as a boy to Bari and Benevento; his youth spent under the care of Archbishop Milo of Benevento who was a great admirer of a group of Calabrian hermits; Stephen's desire to found his own community after their example; his obtaining of papal permission to do so after spending four years in the household of a cardinal; his return to France and eventual establishment of a hermitage near Limoges; and his death in a veritable odour of sanctity after passing fifty years in austerities at Muret, accompanied latterly by a few disciples. After Stephen's death, these disciples, under the influence of a vision - and also under more mundane pressures from monks of a nearby house - migrated from Muret to Grandmont with the body of their leader and came to form the nucleus of the order of Grandmont. From this milieu, and under the direction of the energetic fourth prior of the order, Stephen of Liciac, emanated a Liber Sententiarum composed well after Stephen's death, but supposedly containing his contemporary Hugh Lacerta's memories of his sayings and philosophy²⁶; a pseudo-epigraphic Rule²⁷; and thirdly, between thirty and fifty years after Stephen's death, the Life containing the account of his youth in Italy. The evidence of the Life, formerly considered to be questionable but rehabilitated by the work of Becquet has been accepted for several years as reliable; but a detailed consideration of the assumptions on which this evidence is based will indicate, in reality, an absence of direct connections between Grandmont and Calabria. The prevalent notion that there existed some direct links between Italo-Greek monasticism and the new orders and congregations rests on extremely shaky foundations indeed -

as does Becquet's magisterial new edition of the Scriptores Ordinis Grandimontensis, a collection of early Grandmontine texts but one made without any historical introduction.

It is not the intention here merely to dismiss or demolish the work of Becquet or the myth of Byzantine influence: more positively, the third section of this work will attempt to reconstruct, from the material available to us, an alternative explanation of the origins of Grandmont. But before proceeding to the main section of the thesis and then to this concluding one, it might be as well, by way of introduction, to deal with the myths which afflict the study of the origins of the new orders - in particular, Leclercq's pervasive thesis of decline and crisis. An examination of this may help us understand why the idea of external influence on western European monastic developments has been allowed to gain such currency; and it equally suggests why the non-Italian basis of Grandmont has never been properly investigated. It is not my intention in this initial section to introduce a great deal in the way of 'original' material: rather, it is to survey the current state of our knowledge of eleventh and twelfth century monasticism and to demonstrate why the mythical concepts of Benedictine decline and eastern influence should be fundamentally unacceptable to the historian.

B. (i) The evolution of the new monastic orders

The conventional model of the development of the new monastic orders up to the end of the twelfth century is one of an initial enthusiasm followed by a gradual decline into worldliness and an abandonment of the original ideal of apostolic poverty. Historians are generally in agreement about the existence of this decline and the reasons for it; and many cite twelfth-century authors to prove their point. Leclercq puts forward his position succinctly in 'The monastic crisis of the eleventh and twelfth centuries', where he refers, first of all to the Cistercians:

In the Exordium parvum, the first 'statutes of the monks of Cîteaux, formerly of Molesmes' laid it down that they should never assume ownership of goods other than the fruit of their own toil, and one of the first decrees of their general

chapter is headed 'On not having revenues'. It was on this account that the Cistercians, by favour of the Holy See were dispensed from tithes and other taxes on revenue to which wealthy abbeys were liable.

'Such were the ideals and constitution, but what were the facts? At Clairvaux itself, during St Bernard's lifetime, the ruling was faithfully observed; but from the very year of his death, the cartulary reveals infractions. In other places they did not even wait until 1153 before beginning to accept donations contrary to the rule. Alexander III issued a solemn warning to the General Chapter of 1169. He denounced as an abuse the fact that Cistercians were accepting revenues in the same way as other monks.....'28

Knowles, in The Monastic Order in England writes of the English Cistercians in the twelfth century that, 'A breach...had been made in the primitive regularity, and the consequences were permanent and most unfortunate'.²⁹ Of La Cava, Chaise-Dieu and of Chézal-Benoit he observes that all:

became in time normal black monk houses. In all these cases and in many others we see the fervent individual, dissatisfied with contemporary monasticism, beginning anew in simplicity and attracting others of a like mind. Then follows the rapid growth of the house until its founder, who had not desired the eremitical life as such, and who certainly had no theoretical quarrel with the Rule, adopts almost en bloc the customs of an existing monastery, Cluny or another, having given to the monastic life an infusion of new vigour, but no change of direction.³⁰

The ideas expressed here by Knowles are rather more complex than those in his simple condemnation of Cistercian decadence, but his underlying theme remains the same: he sees, in the new orders, a gradual abandonment of their early ideals, a sliding into worldliness. The adoption of 'the customs of an existing monastery' represents to him the relinquishing of an opportunity to create something new and revolutionary, a loss of spiritual impetus, a gentle slide into a less strenuous asceticism: both he and Leclercq can only regret this decline, and their views, expressed with such force and clarity have influenced a wide variety of writers on monasticism.

There is no doubt that this picture of the decadence of the new orders has a respectable historical ancestry: it owes its existence to the often caustic observations of contemporaries on the hermits and monks who appeared to be peopling their world in ever-increasing numbers. In 1958, Leclercq published in the Revue Bénédictine the poem of Payen Bolotin 'against the false hermits', a sharp, if somewhat repetitious,

piece of invective against an unidentified order of religious whose outward holiness was according to the author, a canon of Chartres, a cloak for avarice and greed. They are compared to the plague of frogs which was visited upon Egypt; and their hypocrisy is contrasted with the austere way of life of the saintly bishop Hugh of Nevers who had himself originally been a hermit. The poem which was written in the 1130s paints a sometimes vivid picture of the activities of these 'false hermits':

Horrea, penus, avena replentur; res cumulatae
multiplicantur; multiplicatis nec saturantur³¹

Orderic Vitalis refers in complimentary terms to this poem in his Ecclesiastical History: but while he concedes that the new orders contain something of the vera religio, he also believes that they contain many hypocrites of the type against which Payen Bolotin rails³².

Leclercq also refers in another article to the writings of two other twelfth-century churchmen who viewed with alarm the decline of the new orders. The first of these is Gilbert of Swineshead who wrote in a letter to Roger, the abbot of the Cistercian abbey of Byland:

Vera deserta a patribus nostris, qui nescierunt possessiones
sed pietatem; non rebus intendere, sed religioni. O tempora!
O mores!

And later:

Quaesierunt patres antiqui loca horrida, arrida....
Plus manuum artificio quam agrorum cultu vitam transigebant..
Haec nostra aetas in deterius mores...Ipsi primates
ordinis, quam fastidiosi sunt in domibus.....

Leclercq's second witness is Walter Map (although he does consider him to be partial):

Ecclesiarum possessiones demoverunt et omnimodas iniustas
adeptiones, labore manum suarum cum Apostolo viventes,
omni secluse cupiditate; sed ad tempus nescio quid
proposuerint, aut in botris promiserint, sed quicquid
promiserint subsecutus est fructus, unde timemus arbores.
In omnibus tunc se suppliciter et simpliciter habebant,
nihil avide, nihil proprie facientes.....³³

Both writers refer to the differences between early monasticism and their own day: both, according to Leclercq, are clearly exponents of the theory of decline. He might also have quoted from the Speculum Ecclesiae of Gerald of Wales who takes a similarly sour view of the monks of early thirteenth century Wales. His initial remarks concern the Grandmontines:

With the passage of time the dispensing advice of older and more mature men tempered the statutes which had been made at the beginning without discretion or consultation and with excessive harshness. So that at present they are allowed to possess, like the Cistercians, as many ploughs and tools, cattle and sheep, broad lands and pastures as they need. They also accept with gratitude the ecclesiastical benefices given them by the faithful with charitable generosity, but not the cure of souls, which they renounce and refuse on account of the accompanying dangers. In this they resemble both the Cluniacs and the Carthusians, just as they differ from the Cistercians in the said excessive quantity of both moveable and unmoveable property. And they are neither ashamed nor afraid to possess churches which it /the order of Grandmont/ previously refused with greater devotion and religious perfection, just as in recent times, the order of Citeaux, desiring at last to return to its vomit, not without grave scandal, resembles both Cluniacs and Grandmontines in this matter³⁴.

But it is with the Cistercians that Leclercq is primarily concerned and he has never reproduced this passage. Instead, he concentrates on some key passages in letters written to the Cistercians by Alexander III which he first brought to light in 1954, and to which, as we have already seen he refers in 'The monastic crisis of the eleventh and twelfth centuries'. In these passages Alexander reproaches the Cistercians for 'a decline from the institutes, a departure from the original statutes of the order' which forbade the possession of altars, tithes, or churches, the acceptance of mills or villas and rusticos, the practice of burial inside the monastery. He uses very similar terms in a recently-discovered letter to the abbots of Swineshead and Furness:

Relatum est nobis, quod vos religionis intuitu Cistercensium fratrum ordinem suscepitis, ipsum sicut decuit et eius exigunt instituta nullatenus observatis. Audivimus siquidem, quod villas et rusticos habeatis et eos in causam ducentes notis pecuniariis condemnatis et more secularium dominorum ius patronatus in dandis ecclesiis vendicatis.....Monemus, quatenus, quia eundem ordinem sicut audivimus, suscepistis, instituta illius per omnia conservetis et villas et rusticos quietantes in dandis ecclesiis vobis nihil vendicetis..... Quod si predicta, secundum commonitionem nostram volueritis emendare, noveritis vos venerabilis fratri nostro Eboracensi archiepiscopo in mandatis dedisse ut hoc capitulo cistercensi significet et, si id per emendatum non fuerit, nobis studeat celerius intimare³⁵.

Again, Leclercq is offering contemporary texts as evidence for the decline of the original Cistercian ideal; and he concludes this particular article with statutes from the third quarter of the twelfth century which forbid, at considerable length, any ostentation or

accumulation of possessions on the part of the order. 'All these texts' declares Leclercq, 'provide a good illustration of what we know of Cistercian history in the second half of the twelfth century. The order experienced what could be called a crisis of prosperity'³⁶. The expansion of the new orders had brought with it prosperity; and this prosperity was inevitably accompanied by a decline from the austere ideals of their founding fathers.

It would be extremely foolhardy to attempt to argue that the largest of the new orders, that of Cîteaux, did not prosper greatly during the twelfth century, did not amass land, and did not begin to accept tithes from the labour of other men, as Leclercq points out, before 1153. My initial concern here is not to investigate the accuracy of this picture of a fairly steep decline in Cistercian ideals - although this will be touched on at a slightly later stage - but to see how far the observations of Leclercq, Knowles and others can be applied to some of the other orders, communities, and congregations of the period.

Since the example of Cîteaux is ever present in the minds of historians, it may be as well to begin this short survey by examining the case of a congregation which merged with Cîteaux in 1147 and which, according to Leclercq, 'was to prove such a heavy drag on Cistercian history in the second half of the twelfth century'. This was the order of Savigny, founded in the early years of the century by Vitalis of Mortain. The 'heavy drag' to which Leclercq refers is that of the congregation's increasing wealth and its acceptance of tithes; here once again, the thesis of spiritual decline following on material prosperity is being advanced. According to Leclercq:

During the good years of Vitalis of Mortain and his immediate successors, Savigny and its daughters became radiating centers of the eremitic life, places of marked austerity, solitude, and poverty. Later, however, they were to press their claim to tithes and revenues so insistently that Alexander III was obliged repeatedly to admonish them severely, and he insisted on these 'new houses' conforming to the statutes and obligations of the others³⁷.

Leclercq's remarks on the original austerity and solitude of the order are drawn in part from the Life of Vitalis in the Acta Sanctorum and in part from Alexander III's admonitory letters to the Cistercians.

Taken together they appear to provide sound evidence for the thesis of decline. But, when contrasted with the observations made in Buhot's pioneering study of Savigny, their validity appears highly questionable. Buhot, an undoubted authority on Savigny states that:

Cîteaux or Clairvaux never chose such a propitious spot for the development of a great monastery. For if Savigny was sufficiently distant from the world for religious fervour to flourish there, its economic situation was no less exceptional. It was placed, in effect at the meeting-point of three provinces - Normandy, Maine, and Brittany. If the neighbouring bourgs of Le Teilleul, Landivy, and Louvigné, were of little importance, Mortain was only twenty kilometres away and it was easy even at this epoch to get to Fougères or Mayenne. We can also see that Savigny benefitted throughout its entire history from the generosity of the counts of Mortain, the counts of Mayenne, and the lords of Fougères. Finally the richness of the soil was a guarantee of prosperity for the 'moines cultivateurs'. The lands which they succeeded in acquiring became fertile thanks to their labour, and Savigny, a power both economic and moral would be able to spread throughout the world³⁸.

The picture drawn here by Buhot provides a powerful counter to Leclercq's thesis of a decline from an early fervour.

The order of Savigny cultivated from its beginnings an awareness of the world and the economic circumstances in which it found itself; and that awareness, however cautious, was to a great degree responsible for the success and diffusion of its houses. Leclercq's references to the solitude and poverty of the order under Vitalis and his earliest successors, a prelude, in his eyes, to later decadence have a curious ring when compared with the remarks of Orderic Vitalis on the institutions of the Savignacs. He records that Vitalis's successor Geoffrey began his rule by making more severe the customs of his predecessor³⁹. Clearly, the history of the Savignac houses which continued to accept tithes after their merger with Cîteaux in 1147 (and it is remarkable that complaints against this came not from the Cistercians themselves as Leclercq's thesis might lead us to expect, but from the papacy⁴⁰) cannot be fitted into any neat theory of decline from an original idealism. It should be seen instead in terms of a constant and pragmatic evolution which embraced both semi-eremitical practices and an awareness of economic realities and which would eventually lead to the not inconsiderable success of the congregation and its acceptance by the powerful order of Cîteaux.

Could the case of Savigny mean that the vita apostolica - a

concept bandied about by a wide variety of monastic authors in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, from the reformer Peter Damian to the author of the De Vita Vere Apostolica - covers a wider variety of states of the monastic life than traditional interpretations, which stress a notion of absolute poverty above all, admit? The case of the Austin canons appears to suggest that this may indeed be the case. The appearance of this order in numbers from the mid-eleventh century on was one of the first signs of change in the religious and monastic climate; and the canons have the best title to be discussed in relation to the vita apostolica, as this phrase occurs in the so-called Rule of St Augustine which was composed long before the rules of the other new orders. As Constable observes in his excellent work on monastic tithes, 'The regular canons also accepted tithes at an early date'. He divides the canons into 'strict' and 'moderate' tendencies and goes on to comment that:

Even those historians who emphasise most strongly the contemplative ideals of the strict regular canons and their resemblance to the reformed monks are agreed that they soon conformed to the standards of the more moderate canons and often owned parish churches and revenues even if they were unwilling to perform pastoral work themselves⁴¹.

The example of the Austin canons recalls that of St Norbert, the founder of the Praemonstratensians who, as early as 1121 accepted two churches at Floreffe, both of which received tithes (and one of them an additional nona) from the demesne lands of the count of Namur⁴². Do the actions of the 'strict' canons and those of Norbert really constitute evidence of decadence? More significantly, these examples and Constable's comments on them reveal the existence, within the general framework of the canonical life, of various groupings which held different views on the desirability of using the fruit of other men's labours (and which were not necessarily hostile towards each other).

Even in the case of the Cistercians who undoubtedly amassed tithes and land, the evidence does not suggest that we are dealing with a straightforward case of decadence or a decline in fervour; it points, rather, to a more complex reality. Leclercq, as we have seen, indicates the acceptance of tithes by some Cistercian houses even before Bernard's death and by Cîteaux itself from 1153 onwards. This picture of Bernard as a guardian of purity in the matter of tithes is difficult to reconcile with the record of his witnessing of the acceptance of tithes by the Praemonstratensian house of Basse-Fontaine in 1146⁴³. It may appear,

initially, that the only question at stake here is that of the role and views of Bernard himself; and supporters of Leclercq's arguments would no doubt be quick to point out that he assigns to the maverick Savignac congregation a large part in what he sees as the debasement of early Cistercian ideals. But Bernard's writings are an expression of the spirit of the order which he himself did so much to mould; and Constable has uncovered several cases of acceptance of tithes by Cistercian houses at an early stage in the order's development. The earliest known case at the moment is that of the house of Camp in Germany which began to receive them in 1130. Does this merely indicate that the Cistercians began to betray the spirit of their primitive legislation, which forbade the acceptance of tithes, at a very early date?

A more sophisticated view of the whole situation may be gleaned from the researches of other historians, notably Hoffmann. His article on the development of Cistercian economic principles, in which he relies mainly on evidence from north-east Germany, appeared as long ago as 1910: and in it he postulates not a decline, but the emergence from about 1150 onwards of a distinctive Cistercian type of economic activity and organisation⁴⁴. If we also take into account Constable's discovery of the acceptance of tithes as early as 1130⁴⁵, the beginnings of this activity can be pushed back to a date much nearer that of the inception of the order itself. Recently, Baker has pointed to the inevitable enmeshment of Cîteaux, even in its earliest days, in the feudal world which surrounded it and to the seeming disparity between theory and practice when it came to the acceptance of benefactions:

The list of ducal and noble benefactions supply a significant gloss upon the earliest regulations for the receipt of benefactions at Cîteaux, and the prohibition in the penultimate chapter of the Exordium parvum of the keeping of the ducal court at Cîteaux on great feast days is a further indication of the close ducal interest in Cîteaux, which made of it 'le Saint-Denis de Bourgogne'. Perhaps the clearest indication, however, of the position of the new house in the feudal and ecclesiastical world of Burgundy, and in the monastic ambience of Cluny can be found in its early and local foundations - Maizières founded in 1132 upon, and to administer, Cîteaux's rich properties in the neighbourhood of Mersault: La Bussière, in 1131, on a rich site in the valley of the Ouche to the west of Dijon, conveniently close to the main road north from Dijon to Tonnerre, and early patronised by the court and nobility of Burgundy as its church and surviving buildings demonstrate. Above all, however, there is La Fertéthe first daughter house of Cîteaux established upon a fine site overlooking the valley of the Grosne not far from

its junction with the Saone and beside the main valley road⁴⁶.

The Cistercians, evidently, were perfectly capable from an early date on of reconciling their involvement with the feudal world which surrounded them with their theoretical desire to avoid it.

These considerations all render infinitely more comprehensible the presence of St Bernard at the donation of tithes to Basse-Fontaine in 1146; and they push us even further away from the straightforward concept of decline in the new orders. Even at this stage it is becoming clear that the vita apostolica, in its economic and social implications, can be interpreted in a much more fluid sense than it hitherto has been; and to view this from another angle we can turn to the case of Afflighem.

The ambivalent attitude towards the society of the time which characterises certain aspects of the Cistercian and Savignac way of life was not reproduced in all the new orders and communities of the period; other houses could and did enforce separation from the world as rigorously as possible. Dereine has possibly isolated one example of such an attitude in his study of Afflighem⁴⁷. He convincingly demonstrates that this foundation did not, as was previously thought, adopt Cluniac customs but decided instead on a course of considerable austerity, and he has also found that tensions arose between the first and second generations of monks over the question of whether a tithe from the donations given for building a church should be used for hospitality and care of the poor. The founding generation gave its answer to this problem:

The sustaining of his flock pleases God more than the raising up of walls, but nothing should be omitted which is necessary for the worship of God and divine service⁴⁸.

While it was impermissible to cut corners where worship was concerned, the care of the needy took place over ostentatious building. Here, if we accept the significance with which Dereine seeks to invest this debate, we have possibly found one case where Leclercq's decline may almost have set in; but rather than providing backing for his general thesis the case of Afflighem only serves to emphasise further the complex mixture of approaches to spirituality and economics which went together to make up the sum total of the approach to the vita apostolica.

B (ii) Contemporary critics and their value

But we cannot forget that Leclercq is able to quote contemporary sources which apparently negate this concept of variety and back up his own view of monastic decadence. He cites a number of writers, most notably Payen Bolotin, the author of the poem against the false hermits, and the letters of Alexander III; indeed to judge by the chronology of his articles it was the study of these authors which originally led him to formulate his idea of the crisis of prosperity in twelfth-century monasticism. Walter Map and Gilbert of Swineshead are also among his witnesses; and, as we have already seen, the often caustic comments of Gerald of Wales could also be used to demonstrate a decline in ideals⁴⁹. But should we take all these authors seriously? Contemporary commentators are by no means always accurate analysts of their own situation, as Bodin demonstrated when he made the influx of precious metals from the new world solely responsible for the inflation which affected Europe in the sixteenth century. A second glance at the fulminations of Gerald, Walter, Gilbert of Swineshead, and Payen Bolotin suggests that we may be dealing with a similar case here.

The singular lack of balance in the comments of Gerald of Wales and Walter Map on the new monasticism had been indicated by Knowles in his Monastic Order in England six years before the appearance of the first of Leclercq's articles in which he uses their articles as evidence of a 'crisis of prosperity'. Knowles issues a measured warning to later historians:

Both /Gerald and Walter/ were severe and persistent critics of the monastic body and as their writings, not without influence in their own day continue to be sources from which modern students derive both fact and opinions, it is necessary to consider in some detail the nature and the truth of the charges which they bring against the monks⁵⁰.

This he goes on to do in magisterial fashion: he surveys both the historical accuracy and the evidence of bias in the two authors, and he concludes that neither merits any special trust. The evolution of Gerald's own particular bêtes noires between the composition of the Journey Through Wales and his later works is particularly obvious. In the Journey, he has some good words for the white monks, and favourably compares their generosity and provision for the poor with that of the Benedictines. His original hostility towards the black monks

stemmed, apparently, from a conflict with Peter de Leia; and it was his involvement with Hubert Walter which would lead him, eventually, to produce similar, if even more trenchant criticisms of the Cistercians⁵¹. As Knowles shows, Gerald's works between 1198 and 1203 all contain criticisms of his personal enemies; but the Speculum Ecclesiae (completed c 1216?) ranges even wider:

Lacking the cohesion which the narrative form imposes on much of Gerald's earlier work, it consists for the most part of a catalogue of instances of monastic corruption and depravity. Quidquid agunt monachi.....Yet for all the length of the book, Gerald deals with surprisingly few concrete, individual cases, and several of these are related without names or with only the vaguest of references. When the historian comes to assessing the value of Gerald's arraignment of contemporary monasticism, a kind of paralysis invades him; he has a sense that he is hunting a nightmare or grappling with wraiths. For to suppose that Gerald had the intention, similar to that of a later reformer or modern critic of arraigning the monks of his time before the bar of the world's or posterity's judgement is to attribute to his mind a consistency and purpose which it did not possess.....

Beyond this, it is always singularly difficult to grasp one of Gerald's stories and (to use the modern phrase) to nail it to the counter.....⁵²

In the Speculum Ecclesiae Gerald has progressed to criticisms of both black and white monks in just such general and unspecific terms. Knowles demonstrates very clearly the inadvisability of treating him as a reliable witness; and the same applies to Walter Map of whom, apparently unaware of Knowles' analysis, Leclercq has made use.

Knowles demolishes Map with equal vigour. Walter's rancour in the De Nugis Curialium is directed almost exclusively at the Cistercians whom he accuses of avarice; and Knowles writes of his 'bitter general accusations mingled with a number of isolated examples and a fair proportion of ribaldry'⁵³. Map's criticisms, like Gerald's are too personal and far too unspecific to be taken seriously. (The same applies to Nigel Wireker's criticisms of the Cluniacs and the regular canons⁵⁴.) As for the last English source used by Leclercq, the letter of Gilbert of Swineshead to the Cistercian Roger of Byland, the terms in which his complaints are couched once more prevent us from placing too much reliance on him as a source for any 'crisis of prosperity'. Like all the authors whose complaints we have so far seen, he is writing in the most general of terms; and any passage prefixed by the Ciceronian 'O tempora! O mores!' as is the one quoted by Leclercq

could be interpreted with some justification as evidence of a disgust with the world at large.....Gilbert merely appears to be saying that earlier monks had, on the whole, a harder time of it; and while we might agree with him that they were therefore more virtuous, it is difficult to escape the feeling that we are either listening to a man whose mistrust of the modern world was developed to a high degree - or even just to a querulous member of an older generation.

The English sources for Leclercq's thesis appear to carry no great weight (although one strange occurrence may be mentioned at this point: Knowles, while repudiating Gerald, Walter, and Nigel Wireker, elsewhere subscribes to the idea that some measure of decline had taken place - 'a breach had been made in the primitive regularity'⁵⁵ - and this comment has certainly influenced Leclercq). But against all this, the continental evidence which Leclercq brings forward must be considered; and this - the poem of Payen Bolotin and the letters of Alexander III to the Cistercians - initially presents a pretty formidable appearance. Might it even be the case that the new orders underwent, on the continent, a period of relaxation which was somehow avoided in England?

To evaluate the evidence of the poem of Payen Bolotin (from which some extracts have been quoted above) one important problem must be immediately determined. Is it possible to identify the hermits against whom he rails so bitterly? Leclercq, aware of the importance of this point, has devoted a considerable amount of space to this problem: much of his article is given over to an attempt to explain it⁵⁶.

Other historians, notably Meyer, had dealt with this question of identity before. Meyer rejects any identification of the hermits in question with the followers of Robert of Arbrissel, because no mention is made of the role which Robert assigned to women, such a notable feature of his teaching and practice. He also rejects the notion that Payen Bolotin may have been specifically writing about St Bernard⁵⁷.

Leclercq himself considers other eremitical foundations and leaders: William Firmat, Bernard of Tiron, Gerald of Salles, Gerald of Cadouin, Vitalis of Mortain, Stephen of Muret, and Geoffrey of Loroux or Babion, the last himself the object of another verse satire.

Leclercq considers that even Geoffrey did not deserve all the reproaches made by Payen and does not make the link between the two⁵⁸. Similarly, Bernard could not have been the subject of the poem as, when it was written (1120-35) the Cistercians were not involved in preaching or the pastoral ministry, and so could hardly be the 'gyrovagues' of whom Payen writes⁵⁹. Werner has discussed the idea that Payen may have been referring to the Praemonstratensians; but there were no Praemonstratensian houses in the area of Chartres where Payen lived, and so Leclercq dismisses this conjecture⁶⁰.

The position eventually adopted by Leclercq is that no one foundation, congregation, or order exhibits all the characteristics which Payen Bolotin describes; he also maintains that none of the houses in the area of Chartres could be accused of all the faults mentioned in the poem, which he rightly characterises as a satire ('The criticism is forced and exaggerated to render it more effective.....')⁶¹ These conclusions which Leclercq draws, in an article composed before - and closely related to - 'The monastic crisis of the eleventh and twelfth centuries' bear a startling resemblance to Knowles's condemnation of Gerald of Wales and Walter Map; but Leclercq does not see them in this light, failing to realise that the non-specific and satirical nature of the poem really puts it outside the category of reliable evidence. Lately, the poem has been placed in a more appropriate context by Smalley who categorises it as the work of a traditionalist who was out to condemn any novelty - at all costs:

.....novelty is not only bad in itself; it prophesies something worse, that is the coming of Antichrist; the new orders make ready for him⁶².

The author of such extreme views is hardly a reliable witness on the state of the new orders.

The final, and most powerful testimony with which we must come to terms is contained in the 'suppressed passage' in the letter Inter innumeras written by Alexander III to the Cistercians in 1169⁶³. In this, Alexander not only warns of the looming danger of deviation from the order's original ideas of poverty, but criticises the acquisitions of villas et rusticos which had already taken place. Later generations of Cistercians were sufficiently ashamed of these criticisms to suppress them and Leclercq is responsible for bringing the 'lost' passage to our attention. Alongside the stern words of the pope, he also reproduces

the statutes of a general chapter held at some time between 1174 and 1182, in which he perceives an 'admirable effort' to curb the increasing instances of ostentation and ownership of property on the part of the cistercian order. These texts more than any others presented by Leclercq would seem to confirm that one order at least underwent a 'crisis of prosperity' and a decline in its primitive ideals. In fact, they might more profitably be considered as highlighting the problems of analysis and classification which confront the historians of the new orders. The question here is not the relatively simple one of acceptance or rejection of evidence advanced in the form of sources: it is, rather, the infinitely more difficult one of the emotional and moral stance which should or should not be adopted in dealing with the history of the first century of Cîteaux.

In a footnote to his article on the excised passages in Alexander III's letters, Leclercq refers to the work of Hoffmann⁶⁴. Hoffmann has already been referred to for his researches on the Cistercian houses of north-east Germany in which he concludes that the development of distinctive Cistercian principles of economic activity and organisation emerged within a century of its foundation; and more recent research seems to be pushing the date of the beginnings of this activity nearer and nearer the order's earliest days. This is not Hoffmann's only contribution to our understanding of the problem; he attempts to explain to some extent the reasons for this development by commenting on the difficulties of maintaining an enclosed (and by implication 'primitive' or 'pure') economy in the midst of a society which was increasingly turning to the use of money. Considered alongside the evidence brought forward by Baker which highlights Cîteaux's involvement with the feudal society of Burgundy, Hoffmann's thesis might well lead us to conclude that the primitive legislation of the Exordium parvum may in reality be less representative of the Cistercian mentality and approach to life than is generally thought - and this simply because of extraneous factors for which the Cistercians cannot be held responsible. But Leclercq, who had the work of Hoffmann available to him, draws no such conclusion. He adopts a stance in essence similar to that of Viard who believes that the renunciation of tithes by the new orders was made 'in a moment of fervour and disinterestedness, which did not last for long, because if the spirit was willing the flesh was weak'⁶⁵.

The words of Alexander III do provide some justification for

the adoption of such a moralistic stance; but it is ultimately of little value to the historian. Alexander was writing in an age when a newer version of the reform papacy had succeeded to that to which Gregory VII gave his name; and since the days of Alexander II and Peter Damian the papacy had attempted to spearhead various drives towards a new morality in terms of acceptance of tithes and of other financial or commercial transactions, most notably the buying and selling of ecclesiastical offices for money. It could perhaps even be argued that the papacy's stance over against financial or commercial involvement on the part of the church was more central to its programme of reform than it was to the new orders which, under the banner of the vita apostolica, embraced a variety of modes of attitudes to the world. The papacy, as Alexander III clearly understood, was duty-bound to moralise; and the Cistercians themselves were sufficiently sensible of the moral rectitude, in absolute terms, of his stance to attempt as the statutes presented by Leclercq show, to follow his guidelines. But the lines of their own economic development and that of western Europe in general had already taken shape, and the statutes were attempting to change a course of events by now inevitable. Cîteaux could not escape involvement in the world nor, -despite contemporary protestations, did it seem to - and the term 'decline' which according to Leclercq 'suggests itself spontaneously when one is attempting to characterise this situation' is really an inappropriate form of description. Like Alexander III, Leclercq is imposing a moral judgement upon the Cistercians, and on the new orders as a whole. It is hardly the prime or primary duty of the historian to moralise; even less so in cases such as this where an essentially emotional approach has only succeeded in obscuring an essentially complex and delicate situation.

B (iii) Other views of the new orders

The discussion so far has tended to ignore the well-known circumstance that the twelfth century, far from being an age in which writers took an exclusively hostile look at the new orders, was also a period in which they were welcomed and praised. Two works in particular stand out, not only for their lack of hostility towards the new orders but also for their acceptance of, and emphasis on, an aspect of the new orders' existence which has up till now been only tentatively

suggested: their ambiguities, variations, and diversity. The first of these works is the Book of divers professions and orders in the church⁶⁶; the other is Book One of the Dialogues of Anselm of Havelberg⁶⁷.

The Libellus de Diversis Ordinibus was composed by a canon of Liège who we know only as 'R' in the mid-twelfth century. The Liège area was one which enjoyed a remarkable variety of forms of the religious life; and it is this variety which 'R' sought to highlight. As Constable remarks in his introduction to the text:

The most remarkable feature of the Libellus, however, is not its factual descriptions of the various ways of the religious life, but its analysis of the spiritual tendencies /and here Constable might perhaps have added, economic and social tendencies/ of these movements. The author's perception that the fundamental distinction was not between the orders of hermits, monks and canons but between the strict, moderate, and lax groups within each order, and that the fundamental similarity, therefore, was between the similar tendencies in each order, gives the Libellus a special place amongst the twelfth-century treatises on the religious life and is an insight still not fully appreciated by scholars who are primarily concerned with establishing the precise difference between the various orders⁶⁸.

Setting aside the somewhat moralistic approach which has crept into Constable's description of the tendencies within three main groupings of monks, canons and hermits, one which is not borne out entirely by the text itself, this is an admirable exposition of the author's method. 'R' has no particular axe to grind on behalf of any one division or tendency of the monastic or canonical life: his vision is capable of embracing them all. His frequent and complex allusions to biblical texts show his desire to justify the existence of all the callings and orders of the church. This rather primitive method leads him to compare the canons who lived close to men to the Gersonites of the Old Testament and to cite from the New Testament the example of Christ praying on the mount of Olives and his disciples following him there⁶⁹. All the orders are justified in similar fashion; all serve God, and their very diversity shows the wonder of God's plan. 'R' perceives clearly the differences in organisation and way of life of his groupings, which he divides up not on overtly economic grounds, but on the less obvious one of their proximity to other men. No attempt is made to pass judgement on those groupings which Constable would characterise as lax: 'R' accords them all a place in the magnificent

harmony of the divine plan. He remarks, with regard to the differences in approach to food, clothing, and manual labour:

I desire to show that, although they live differently, they aspire from one beginning to one end which is Christ⁷⁰.

There could be no clearer justification for regarding the vita apostolica as a state which could, even in the eyes of a twelfth-century commentator, be reached by a number of paths, all of them equally legitimate. The straightforward and rational approach of the Libellus provides us with a valuable corrective to the hostile outpourings of the same period which have hitherto exercised their baleful influence over modern opinion, although we are still some way off from according this valuable work the attention which it really deserves.

The Dialogues of Anselm of Havelberg reflect an attitude which is similar although developed in an infinitely more sophisticated fashion. Anselm was certainly not inimical to the novelty of the new orders as he was originally a scholar and a Praemonstratensian canon who then went on to lead a life in which change and novelty played a great part: he became, successively bishop of Havelberg, a papal legate on the Wendish crusade of 1147, a legate to Constantinople, and finally archbishop of Ravenna. Influenced by the apocalyptic prophecies, he divided the history of the church into seven ages, placing his own lifetime in the fourth, when it was persecuted by hypocrites. These he identified, not with the 'false hermits' of Payen Bolotin or the members of the new orders described thus by Orderic Vitalis but with those who opposed the new orders and ecclesiastical reform. He goes so far as to present innovation and novelties as a constantly recurring factor in the history of the church, a factor which was highly necessary to the church's wellbeing.^{70a}

The writings of 'R', the anonymous canon of Liège, and of Anselm of Havelberg - both the objects of recent study - create an impression of the religious life of the twelfth century which is far removed from that presented by Payen Bolotin, Walter Map, Gerald of Wales, or even Alexander III. They lack the traditionalist or moralistic basis of the writings of this latter group of authors and, as such, provide us with a valuable corrective to the essentially one-sided view of developments which Leclercq presents. As Smalley has indicated in a recent article, the twelfth century saw a constant debate concerning the desirability of tolerating novelty, and among the novelties which emerged, the new

monastic orders occupied a prominent place; and it is instructive to note that while Smalley naturally places Anselm and 'R' amongst the defenders of innovation, she presents Payen Bolotin as a diehard traditionalist with equal facility. But perspectives of this sort are only gradually emerging. Generations of historians have had the concept of decline and of the 'crisis of prosperity' reinforced in their minds by the so-called Cluniac-Cistercian controversy and by the superior attitude adopted by Bernard towards the customs of Cluny. Bernard himself, as the case of the house of Basse-Fontaine demonstrates, was not above sanctioning the acceptance of tithes and Cluny, above all the Cluny of the 1120s which was the target of Bernard's criticisms, is no longer thought of by all historians as a corrupt and declining institution.

This particular question will be dealt with in more depth at a later stage; suffice it to say, at this point, that there has been a considerable shifting in perspective where it is concerned and that Bernard's views are no more taken as a clear indication of Cluniac decline than are the views of Alexander III as proof of Cistercian decay. Recent researches have largely rendered the concept of the 'crisis of prosperity' redundant; and we can now think in terms of replacing this outworn concept - with all its implications of a uniform and easily defined doctrine and practise of poverty - with a definition of apostolic poverty and the apostolic life which recognises the variety of approaches to this elusive ideal. Within the monastic and canonical framework, the vita apostolica was the goal of a great variety of institutions and customs: the 'monks who live close to men such as Cluniacs and the like'; the canons of the house of St-Josse-au-bois who lived 'far from men'⁷¹; the austere Grandmontines, whose original legislation was strict enough to be characterised by the hostile Gerald of Wales as too severe⁷²; the prosperous houses of some of the canons⁷³; the surprisingly entrepreneurial attitude of the Savignacs⁷⁴; and the rigorous outlook of the first generation of the canons of Afflighem⁷⁵. The capacity of the monastic life to absorb a great variety of practises and individual approaches is further illustrated by the case of Pons de Léras whose case has recently been examined by Baker⁷⁶. Pons was a noble brigand who preyed on travellers on the Montpellier-Lodève road, and also on his neighbours, at the end of the eleventh and beginning of the twelfth centuries. Perhaps because of the pious

example of bishop Peter I of Lodève, Pons eventually made a public penance and, after a longish peregrination around the shrines of central and southern France, he and his followers settled near Camares as a hermit group which eventually developed into the Cistercian house of Sylvanès. Dramatic conversions are not unknown in any age; but Pons' retreat to the desert along with a few companions clearly demonstrates both the impact made on him by the new forms of the religious life and also the strength and diversity of a movement which could encompass such a bizarre convert who became, despite his extraordinary origins, 'acceptable to patrons and to ecclesiastical authorities alike'.

The role of the patron in the newer religious foundations has not as yet been fully explored; but we possess strong indications as to its importance. The prohibition, in the Exordium Parvum, of the keeping of the ducal court at Cîteaux on the great feast-days indicates the close connections between the dukes of Burgundy, especially Odo and his son Hugh, and the first Cistercians. An even more significant role, from our point of view, was played by the viscount of Beaune, Raynald who was a relative and a benefactor of Robert both at Molesme and at Cîteaux, for which he donated the site⁷⁷. This dual patronage does much to undermine the notion that Cîteaux was founded as a reaction against laxity at Molesme. It also underlines the role of the pious or generous layman or woman in the new monastic foundations which are too often treated as if they were brought into the world by a sort of parthenogenesis, free from the corrupting influence of the world - an impression created by the profound silence in which some major authors often leave this topic. Yet they could and did exercise a decisive influence over the houses with which they were associated, and the whole topic deserves close examination. Were there, for instance, other patrons like Walter Espec the advocatus of both Kirkham and Rievaulx who was party to a scheme to refound Kirkham elsewhere and transfer the land to Rievaulx, and who, because of his powerful family connections in the north of England consulted no higher ecclesiastical authority about this decision⁷⁸? This is a classic example of a situation in which a house was very closely dependent on its patron, who in turn was closely involved in the feudal society of the surrounding region, and it demonstrates the extraordinary web of ties which could - willy-nilly - bind a house to the society around it. If the major characteristic, and perhaps the strength of the new orders was their diversity, then this diversity was probably, in turn, a result of the pressures of this sort

brought to bear upon individual foundations.

Given such conditions, it is hardly surprising that the monastic aspirants of the period made their way towards the vita apostolica - which is, by now, beginning to emerge as a goal rather than a means of achieving it - by the variety of different roads described by 'R' or Anselm of Havelberg. Certainly it has become increasingly difficult to assign a precise definition, in terms of lifestyle, to the phrase 'apostolic life'. For the author of the De Vita Vere Apostolica, vita apostolica simply equals vita communis⁷⁹. It is true that this communal element in the definition was often stressed at the expense of the other elements which we today would regard as constituting part of the apostolic life: those of preaching and spreading the gospel. (That these were not totally unconsidered by the twelfth century as a whole is vividly demonstrated in the sculptures over the west portal at Vézelay⁸⁰.) The traditional definition of monks as being of cor unum et anima una may also have helped to reinforce in the minds of historians the notion of a static and relatively easily defined vita apostolica. But however united the monks and canons of the eleventh and twelfth centuries may have been in aspiring towards the apostolic life, the manner in which these aspirations were expressed could and did vary a great deal; as 'R' of Liège remarks, 'although they live differently, they aspire from one beginning to one end which is Christ'. It is clear from the foundations and orders surveyed so far, as from this statement that the vita apostolica was a state of one-ness with Christ which was to be achieved perhaps largely - through the practise of poverty⁸¹ but that even this was not the product of only one way of life and could be carried out, as we have seen, in a number of different fashions and subject to a variety of pressures as varied as the locations in which they were established.

Before concluding this section it seems appropriate, by way of reinforcing this definition of the vita apostolica, to attempt to justify a statement made earlier to the effect that, although they strove for perfection in differing ways the new orders and houses were not necessarily hostile towards each other. This is fairly easily done. Anyone superficially aware of the so-called Cluniac-Cistercian polemic of the twelfth century would, on digging a little deeper uncover a stratum of relationships between Cluny and Cîteaux, which would seem surprisingly cordial. Despite the famous episode in which St Bernard

criticised Cluny and its customs⁸², both Cluny and Cîteaux were part of a large, loosely-connected network of houses in which it was recognised that each foundation had its own role to play; and these two were probably more closely bound by the complex feudal and familial ties of Burgundy than is generally recognised at present - although this could, and sometimes did, present problems. (The looser ties between the two houses and others are indicated in the work of Wollasch on confraternities and necrologies, in which he shows that Cîteaux was associated with both old and new orders⁸³. Moreover, Peter the Venerable at one stage wrote to Cîteaux requesting that they commend him and the whole body of Cluny earnestly to their prayers: in 1149 Bernard was able to reply that they had indeed done so⁸⁴. This is a continuation of a tradition which had existed among the older Benedictine houses.)

Overtly literary 'friendships' developed between eminent monastic personalities: Peter and Bernard came to enjoy genuinely amicable relations which were largely based on a community of belief (this will be explained later); and Bernard numbered among his friends other Benedictines such as Alvisius of Anchin and Adenulf of Farfa, to name but two⁸⁵.

Whatever obstacles may have arisen in practise, Bernard in general approved of the idea of diversity in the monastic body, although it caused him occasional anxiety. But Bernard was, after all, the author of the De Laude Novae Militiae; in the Apologia he could compare the church, composed of many different orders united in faith and love to the princess of Psalm 44 'clothed about with varieties' and also to Joseph's seamless coat of many colours and to God's house with its many mansions. He continues in an even more specific vein:

Diverse men receive diverse gifts, one this and the other that, whether they be cluniacs or cistercians, or regular clerics or even faithful laymen.....let each man observe by what way he walks, so that a diversity of ways may not lead him from a single just way for whatever mansion he reaches he will not be excluded from his father's house⁸⁶.

Despite this note of caution - both Bernard and Peter the Venerable were anxious to avoid a schism in the church, and Peter harped continually and rather hypocritically on the worrying matter of different colours of habit - Bernard in theory accepts the notion of diversity. In practise his unshakeable conviction of his own rectitude and the superiority of Cîteaux may have rendered him less than tolerant at times⁸⁷; but it did not render him insensible to the fundamental

characteristic of the movement of which he himself was a part.

We can conclude, then, from a survey of the evidence advanced by Leclercq and others and a rapid review of some of the other research on the new orders that they did not undergo the 'crisis of prosperity' in the twelfth century which Leclercq describes. In place of this concept - which bears all the marks of the historical myth: consideration of insufficient evidence, a detaching of events from their historical context, and the consequent emergence of an over-simplified point of view - we can now begin to substitute the more complex reality. The process, however, is still in its youth, as a number of myths still surround the monastic life at this period. Constable states, for instance, that:

By the year 1200, therefore, many thinkers, whatever their personal allegiances and preferences, were reluctant to declare any single form of religious life the best and were prepared to accept a degree of pluralism with regard to the diversity of types of the religious life which would have been unthinkable a century earlier, and which was still not fully compatible with some of their other views⁸⁸.

He cites as obstacles to total acceptance the frequent struggle between houses over recruits, property and influence; the inherent conflict between a notion approaching that of equality with the medieval concept of the hierarchy; and the possible clash with the legal doctrine of transitus.

On these and other points, therefore, even those who accepted the principle of diversity were inclined to adhere to older views and to argue that although all forms of the religious life were praiseworthy, some were more praiseworthy than others⁸⁹.

It is true that leading figures such as Bernard often showed a natural partiality towards their own orders: but even the encroachments of an increasingly legalistically-minded twelfth century, with its growing concern with transitus and its attempts to tidy away religious movements such as the Humiliati and the Waldensians which did not fit into what was becoming an accepted order, cannot disguise the constant tendency among churchmen towards the acceptance of variety. Six centuries previously, Benedict may have complained about the four types of 'false' monk; but he also recognised more than one type of genuine monasticism when he characterised his Rule as a 'little rule for beginners' and in doing so announced that the cenobitic life was only

a preparation for the more strenuous ascetism of the solitary. Many historians appear to forget that the west, even before the eleventh century knew not only the cenobitic but also the eremitic life⁹⁰ - particularly the eremitic life which was associated with the cenobium, even if the retreat made by the hermit was of long or permanent duration. (It is of particular importance to remember in the context of later discussion on the problem of Byzantine 'influence' on the development of the 'new' orders that some variety of forms of the religious life had previously existed in the west - eremitical groups were to form the basis of some new congregations; the existence of individual hermits was not unknown; and monks might go into retreat from their communities.) Although the forms of monasticism might appear to be more varied in the east - and there were notable regional variations there, in any case - monasticism in the west was not a monolithic institution and this is also demonstrated by the formation of 'congregations' such as that of Cluny.

It is also instructive to remember that the idea of the hierarchy is not totally inimical to change and motion, as it permits movement in an upward direction. Change and diversity were hardly new notions to the church although it would always harbour the timid and the traditionalist to oppose them. The existence of debate and doubt are being deliberately underplayed here not in any wilful spirit but because it is the conservative who still to a great extent appears to dominate current thinking on the new orders. The myth of the 'crisis of prosperity' has largely been constructed from the writings of reactionary individuals; and it has exercised such a powerful fascination over the minds of students of the period that until now, despite the wealth of ammunition to hand and the number of individual forays in this direction, still no concerted attempt has been made to balance the record and to finally de-mythologise the problem. The notion of diversity - significantly highlighted by some authors in the twelfth century itself - is the dominant theme which emerges from this short examination of the existing work on the subject of the new orders; and the scanty but illuminating evidence from - for example - Citeaux and Kirkham strongly suggests that the key to further investigation lies in the local circumstances of the new houses and orders, and that a more complete understanding of the situation will only be arrived at through reference to the power-structures, economies, and societies of the

areas in which they evolved.

C (i) The origins of the new monastic orders

Any new light - however dimly perceived - on the evolution of the new orders in the twelfth century must inevitably lead to a re-examination of the evidence concerning their origins. Here, also, the thesis of decline formulated by Leclercq has had a great influence on current opinion: while it is by no means the only explanation offered for the rise of the new monastic orders, its impact largely derives from its comprehensiveness. No one else has offered one single fundamental reason for the change in the face of monasticism during the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Just over fifty years ago Morin categorised developments in the monastic life of the eleventh century under the heading of a 'crisis of cenobitism'⁹¹; and approximately three decades later Leclercq, influenced by his own apparent discovery of a 'crisis of prosperity' in the twelfth century and mindful of Morin's observations, projected this crisis back into the eleventh century and declared that the new orders arose in reaction to the worldliness of contemporary Benedictinism.

In the opening sections of his article on 'The monastic crisis of the eleventh and twelfth century', Leclercq affirms that the eleventh century was the 'golden age of customaries and of such powerful institutions as Cluny, Gorze, Farfa and Monte Cassino to mention but a few'⁹²; and yet it was also, according to Leclercq who is quoting Morin, a period which witnessed 'the crisis of cenobitism'. From these two observations, Leclercq formulates his 'crisis of prosperity': prosperity precipitated, in his opinion, a reaction in favour of the authentic poverty and austerity of the eremitic life, and led to the appearance of new orders such as the Cistercians, Carthusians, and Grandmontines whose outlook was manifestly severe. The tensions which Leclercq discerns would eventually according to him, be resolved by the retreat to their various deserts of men such as William of Vercelli and John of Matera in Italy and of Gerald of Salles, Vitalis of Mortain, Bernard of Tiron, Stephen of Muret, Robert of Arbrissel and the founders of Cîteaux, in France⁹³.

Leclercq's thesis is, in its simplicity, initially convincing, although on close examination it has seemed to some rather less than

coherent. Baker has voiced the opinion of many scholars in posing a succinct and essentially unanswerable question to those who would still accept Leclercq's and Morin's views:

If the temper of the times was so strongly critical of established monastic ideas as to induce a crisis of 'cenobitism', is it realistic to portray the attitudes of Christian society - of people patrons and ecclesiastics - as so divergent that they forced the new initiatives into a procrustean traditionalism almost indistinguishable from the old?⁹⁴

This is a legitimate question; and on a more fundamental level it might also be asked whether the decline which Leclercq projects back into the eleventh century has any more basis in reality than that which he sees in the twelfth.

There is no essential contradiction in approach between the two basic sections into which 'The monastic crisis of the eleventh and twelfth century' naturally divides. The decline which Leclercq attributes to the great Benedictine houses of the eleventh century - again it is a decline in fervour and ideals which he seeks to highlight, and not one in influence - is demonstrated to his own apparent satisfaction from literary sources. He begins by quoting from poems by Adalbero of Laon and Serlo of Bayeux:

King Odilo of Cluny is my lord
and

Although turn monk the soldier may,
The pauper gains a rich man's pay⁹⁵.

Leclercq frankly admits that there is 'a certain amount of exaggeration in these satires: ill-will and envy employed humour and literary talent to good effect'⁹⁶. Satire, as we have already seen, can be an exceptionally poor guide to actual events. The complaints of Peter Damian, John of Fécamp (Joannelinus), and Leo of Ravenna, however, appear to carry more weight. Leclercq reminds us of Peter's reproaches directed, he says against 'even the most renowned abbots of their day', for involvement in litigation, secular building, and in the case of Richard of St Vanne for his mania for building. John or Joannelinus deplored abuses among clergy and laity and also 'two abuses prevalent amongst the monks': travel and the defence of secular interests. Leclercq cites the remark 'Have we any right to set Mayeul above Christ?' And his third author Leo of Ravenna, 'had to speak in similar vein in like

circumstances'⁹⁷. These three cases apparently constitute more reliable evidence of a moral decline in the prosperous Benedictine houses of the eleventh century. But are they as reliable as they first appear?

The opinions of Peter Damian (1007-1072) must be handled with particular care. In De fuga dignitatum ecclesiasticarum he does indeed, as Leclercq says, condemn time spent by monks in litigation and secular business and the adornment of monastic buildings; but to read Leclercq's account is not to understand the full import of Damian's words⁹⁸. In 1042, Peter wrote a Vita Romualdi⁹⁹; and his thought was permeated by a strain identical to, and doubtless deriving from that of Romuald of Ravenna (c 952-1027). Romuald disliked the cenobitic community, and throughout his career displayed a personal predilection for the eremitic life. And although as Hamilton has recently observed:

In many respects, the differences which existed between Romualdian communities such as Fonte Avellana and Benedictine abbeys in the Cluniac tradition seem more superficial than fundamental¹⁰⁰

the involvement - in whatever degree - in the world which was a necessary consequence of cenobitism was deeply repugnant to Romuald. He himself was a fervent devotee of the solitary life.

Damian was to exhibit a similar desire to escape the secular - and therefore by implication corrupt-world which surrounded him. Although his was one of the great reforming voices of the age, his colleagues in the church noted, with some astonishment, that he showed little desire for active involvement in reform. Despite a fervent belief in the necessity for reforming the church, he shunned the contact with society which was necessary if reforms were to be carried through, preferring to leave this to others¹⁰¹.

It is not, I think, incorrect to diagnose the disgust of both Romuald and Damian as one which was directed primarily against the world and secular society. Both preferred the eremitic - or semi-eremitic - life to that of the coenobium; Damian by no means condemned Cluny or Monte Cassino; and Damian's preference for the eremitical life by no means originated as a criticism of Benedictinism, rather in an attempt to discover a different spirituality in bypassing cenobitic institutions. His remarks are scarcely convincing evidence for a 'crisis of prosperity' in Benedictinism¹⁰². Instead they give, in addition, an insight into the personality of a man who, even independent of Romualdine

influence and in another age, might well have thought and written in the same way.

Another of Leclercq's sources, John of Fécamp, emerges on closer examination in a similar light. It is perhaps more than coincidence that John shared the Ravenniot background of both Romuald and Peter; and although he became prior of Fécamp in Normandy, which itself was a reforming house, he always aspired to the eremitic life, and he also displayed a marked sensitivity to the dangers which involvement in the feudal world could present for a community. Leclercq quotes his letter Tuae Quidem in which he issues a sombre warning to contemporaries:

We believe those to be happy.....those who, having many monasteries travel on horseback across provinces and kingdoms accompanied by horses and knights. If you ask a man of this sort why he presumes to something which is forbidden by the fathers who were inspired by God, he says that he is following the example of the great.....
..... But should we value above Christ¹⁰³?

The name of the abbot Mayeul of Cluny (abbot 954-93) has been inserted in this extract and throughout the letter: Leclercq accepts this as evidence for the moral decline of Cluny, but in reality we do not know that this is whom John meant. It is quite possible that this was added at a later date by someone to whom the name of Mayeul of Cluny was familiar: later, it may have become synonymous with ostentation, although contemporary accounts do not accuse him of this¹⁰⁴. The quotation is deprived of much of its force when a question-mark is put against Mayeul's name; and it is also clear, in any case, that John who, like Peter Damian valued the eremitic life above the cenobitic also feared the dangers of secularisation which were omnipresent in the monastic life. His preoccupations and bias do not permit the use of Tuae quidem as reliable evidence of the state of the Benedictine houses at this period.

The connections with Ravenna enjoyed by the third of Leclercq's exemplars, Leo, might well lead to some fruitful conjectures about, and even a detailed study of, the church in Ravenna in the late tenth and eleventh centuries, for Leo (Archbishop of Ravenna 999-1001) a former abbot of Nonnantola, shares the same preoccupations as Romuald, Damian, and John. He was probably also a major influence on Damian, who related the story of Leo's renunciation of the world, more specifically the archiepiscopate of Ravenna in 1001 to pope Nicholas II. There is a clear link between the spirituality of Leo and Peter: not only did he renounce his archiepiscopate but he also composed an admonition directed at the monks of Darante 'or others who are, like himself hermits', the

work referred to by Leclercq. In this he combines a belief in the essential correctness and efficacy of many of the provisions of the Rule of St Benedict with the earnest message that a well-regulated eremitical community was the only desirable form of monastic life¹⁰⁵. It is difficult to see in this, as Leclercq does, any positive condemnation of Cluniac houses in this work of yet another man whose main desire was to shun the world. Leclercq puts forward the view that

The abbeys grew richer as men of high station came to rely on them.....All this provoked a reaction in favour of authentic poverty, and the only thing which could guarantee that was a return to solitude¹⁰⁶.

A retreat from the world there certainly was in the cases of Peter, Leo, and John and also in those of many others: but there is nothing in the writings cited in 'The monastic crisis' to indicate that it was provoked by the state of the coenobia of the time, and more than a strong suggestion that our authors were influenced, not only by each other but : possibly also by some distinctive current of spirituality emanating from Ravenna itself.

C (ii) Cluny and decadence

Despite his general lack of enthusiasm for the cenobitic life Peter Damian recognised occasional exceptions to his own rules. One such case was that of Cluny, where he stayed for eight days in 1063. At first, the discipline seemed insufficiently harsh to him, and the riches of the house seemed reprehensible:

How can they be holy and have holy men to lead them and such abundance¹⁰⁷?

and he went so far as to suggest that the diet of the monks be reduced. But after following the Cluniac way of life for a week under the guidance of St Hugh, he was later able to write in all sincerity:

When I remember the holy, austere, and good life which you lead in your monastery, I consider that it is not the fruit of human reason, but the work of the Holy Spirit¹⁰⁸.

High praise indeed; and Peter Damian also admired the régime of Desiderius at Monte Cassino. It is, of course, evident that in these cases he was considering the work of two outstanding personalities and he does not seem to have been entirely confident that their houses would sustain this standard of excellence after their deaths. Even so,

it is instructive to consider Damian's attitude to Cluny alongside that of Leclercq. By means of a reference to Mayeul - which is, as we have just seen, extremely doubtful - and from other evidence, Leclercq attempts to demonstrate that this, the greatest of the Benedictine houses of the period, was inevitably destined to undergo a 'crisis of prosperity'. He quotes part of a satirical poem of Adalbero of Laon, and part of another by Serlo of Bayeux and maintains that 'Even the pope himself with St Peter's in Rome could not outdo Cluny as regards the size of the building'. Both the poems and Leclercq's own comments are subjective and need not detain us here; but another point which arises from Leclercq's article is worthy of more detailed consideration. When referring to the Cluniac 'crisis of prosperity' he makes no direct mention of the events leading to the downfall of its abbot Pons de Melgueil in 1122; but there is a strong suggestion that he had this important question in mind as he quotes from the Apologia of St Bernard which is usually held to contain criticism of Pons¹⁰⁹. Is Leclercq correct in assuming that Cluny did indeed undergo a 'crisis of prosperity' in the 1120s?

Whatever Leclercq's assumptions, the problem of Cluniac decadence is now essentially one of historiography. Several historians when confronted with the collective testimony of St Bernard, Peter the Venerable, and Orderic Vitalis, have shown themselves less than convinced that Cluny was in a state of moral collapse in the 1120s and have questioned the reliability of these sources. The traditional view of Cluny is something of a hybrid. According to Leclercq, its original fervour had declined because of increasing wealth, magnificence, and involvement in secular affairs. Fliche and Berlière¹¹⁰ are the leading exponents of the theory that Pons de Melgueil was largely responsible for much of the distress which the Cluniacs underwent after his forced abdication, and it is impossible to escape the conclusion that, when Leclercq quotes from the Apologia, he is concurring in this point of view.

This belief in the culpability of Pons is based on the evidence of the sources composed by Bernard, Peter, and Orderic Vitalis, all of whom discern a crisis in Cluny for which they hold Pons largely responsible. Peter the Venerable, writing in De Miraculis, refers to a 'schism' in Cluny, precipitated by Pons, who,

.....in the early years of his rule was modest enough and of

a restrained disposition, but with the passage of time changed his ways, and in many instances and for a variety of reasons exasperated virtually all the monks so that he quickly stirred them into opposition.¹¹¹

Orderic Vitalis in his Ecclesiastical History tells a slightly different story in which episcopal pressure on the Cluniacs leads to the denunciation of Pons before Calixtus II as 'vehement and prodigal in his actions, a profligate pursuer of useless causes'. Calixtus, however, is only stirred into action, in this account, by Pons's departure on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem without having asked his permission¹¹². The evidence of the Apologia of St Bernard is even less clear as the passage traditionally believed to refer to Pons does not mention him by name. Referring to the magnificent retinues of some abbots, Bernard writes that:

If you saw them you would not say that they were fathers of monasteries but lords of castles, not leaders of souls but rulers of provinces.¹¹³

The contradictory evidence given by Peter and Orderic Vitalis, both writing after the events which they set out to describe and analyse, and the unspecific allegations of Bernard have combined to produce a considerable mistrust of traditional interpretations in the minds of several historians. Two differing constructions have now been put on the affair of Pons. White (1958) Tellenbach (1964) and Zerbi (1972) all indicate a change in curial policy towards local bishops - whose power it was seeking to reinforce - and the exasperation of some of these bishops at the papal privileges of exemption which Cluny still enjoyed¹¹⁴. The alteration in the composition and views of the curia is particularly stressed by White who sees a parallel between the elections of Pons to the abbacy at Cluny and Anacletus II to the papacy in 1130. So profound were these changes that the anomalous situation of Cluny in relation to its local bishops was bound to produce a crisis of some sort: and this eventually manifested itself in Pons's resignation under pressure in 1122.

This interpretation has been recently rejected by Bredero, who cannot detect any significant change in the attitude of the curia towards bishops before 1123¹¹⁵; he also dismisses any suggestion of similarity between the abdication of Pons and those of the abbots of Farfa (1123) and Monte Cassino (1125)¹¹⁶. He suggests that a split did occur within Cluny itself, a split which was not caused by any decadent

behaviour on the part of Pons - otherwise, he reasons, Calixtus would not have hesitated to depose him - and both Orderic and Peter do indeed indicate a hesitation on the part of the pope. Whether or not we may trust them is a matter for debate; but Bredero goes on to offer evidence for the hypothesis that Pons's downfall and the eventual election of Peter the Venerable were both carried through by a traditionalist party which was opposed to Pons's attempts to avoid dietary excesses and elaborate clothing - aspects of the Cluniac regime which Peter Damian had criticised approximately sixty years earlier¹¹⁷. (Here we may have evidence for the first schism in the 'consensus' which is traditionally supposed to have produced the election of the abbots of Cluny; or perhaps the very existence of the 'consensus' can now be questioned.) However, according to Bredero, Peter underwent after his election, a personal or spiritual evolution which led him to undertake his own reforms (and to undergo criticism for them at the hands of Matthew of Albano - in all this there is a clear connection with the debate between traditionalists and innovators which Smalley highlights in other twelfth-century writings)¹¹⁸. But however much Peter may have succeeded in assuming the mantle of the reformer or innovator, he never seems to have lost his distaste for the memory of his unfortunate predecessor: his evidence on the subject of Pons's abdication, a matter of some embarrassment to Cluny and to Peter himself, must be treated with caution¹¹⁹.

The evidence of St Bernard presents other problems. His Apologia, as the extract quoted above shows, makes no direct reference to Pons; and even if we accept the notion that Pons was one of the abbots who could be mistaken, because of his magnificence, for the ruler of a province, Bredero cautions us to remember that Bernard was writing with an eye to enlisting the support of the bishops who would, he says 'have placed this satirical passage in the perspective of their own rancour against Cluny'. In other words, Bredero refuses to invest chapter 27 of the Apologia with the significance hitherto accorded it¹²⁰.

Bredero not only underlines the reforming role of Peter the Venerable (this is also stressed by Constable): he also uses another passage in the Apologia to press further his point that, far from being a lax and dissolute house, Cluny had nurtured the seeds of reform during the reign of Pons. This new insight has been made possible by a revision of the dating of Bernard's letter concerning the 'defection'

of Robert of Châtillon to Cluny from Clairvaux 1124-5, just before the composition of the Apologia, and the consequent establishing of a closer relationship between the two documents¹²¹. In both, according to Bredero, we can see Bernard at work in an attempt to demonstrate to Robert the inferiority of Cluny; but even so there is in the Apologia a passage which, to Bredero, strongly suggests the existence of a debate concerning the necessity for reform at Cluny; and Bernard was intervening in this debate at the request of the reforming party, which made this demand under the name of William of St Thierry. Bernard writes:

If I reprove the vices of individual men rather than those of the order which they have entered, I will be thought of as fighting for the order rather than against it. And I do not fear that those who love their order will do me any harm; indeed, I do not doubt that I will be accepting their thanks if I persecute what they themselves despise. If my words displease anyone, they are showing themselves unwilling to condemn corruption - which itself is a vice - because they have no care for their order. To them I reply in the words of St Gregory: it is better to cause a scandal than to deny the truth.¹²²

The intricacy of the argument presented by Bredero is such that it is, at times, almost a barrier to an understanding of his case; but it is clear - and the work of others supports many of his conclusions - that he is uncovering a new and important range of evidence. Moreover, the possibility of St Bernard intervening in an internal dispute at Cluny becomes much less remote when the proximity of the two houses is taken into consideration; both - it is scarcely necessary to indicate - were situated in Burgundy, and both Peter the Venerable and Bernard came from prominent Burgundian families. So, too, did Pons de Melgueil; and it is tempting to speculate how far the existence of opposed tendencies or factions in Cluny itself sprang not just from views on reform but also from Burgundian family loyalties and feuds.

Whether one accepts the contention of White, Zerbi, and Tellenbach that the fall of Pons was essentially caused by a changing curia or concurs with the views of Bredero, it is clear that recent opinion has moved sharply away from the simple notion of a 'crisis of prosperity' in Cluny. The view that Pons de Melgueil was both responsible for and representative of relaxation and decline is now in retreat in the face of a great weight of evidence which not only offers alternative explanations for the events of the 1120s but suggests that Cluny under the rule of Hugh had suffered from several major problems.

During the long abbatiage of Hugh the congregation had failed to adapt its structures to its growth; and the view has been advanced that during Hugh's latter years, Cluny had lost control over its monasteries (although the extent to which it had exercised control over them even before this is to some extent debatable)¹²³. Perhaps all this could be described as one kind of 'crisis of prosperity' - Bredero describes the economic difficulties of Cluny as 'institutional' in nature¹²⁴ - but it is decidedly not the crisis of which Leclercq writes. The myth of the decline of Cluny, a myth supported in one way or another by many historians, among them Knowles, is gradually going out of fashion to be replaced by a more balanced picture in which the deficiencies of the great houses are recognised, but are also beginning to be seen in conjunction with its strengths. Behind much of our thinking on Cluny lurked, until recently, the eminently un-historical presupposition that the rise of one institution must involve the decline of another: but the barrenness of this approach is rapidly becoming apparent^{124a}.

The subject of Cluny is an exceptionally difficult one with which to deal as historians have been conditioned in their responses towards it by the so-called Cluniac-Cistercian controversy. This usual description of the dispute is somewhat misleading, as Bernard and Peter the Venerable were the major - indeed, almost the only - participants in this often acrimonious war of words. Even Bernard's recognition of the diversity of the monastic life did not prevent him from making criticisms of Cluny which have long been accepted as reliable evidence of its state because it was Bernard who made them. Knowles states that

.....St Bernard must have undoubtedly had truth on his side. Charges of luxury, at once so sweeping and so detailed must have been well founded. Bernard's character is alone sufficient guarantee that there is no direct falsification, and the entire absence of any charges of immorality..... gives more weight to the serious indictment that remains¹²⁵.

Perhaps; but Knowles's choice of words is suitably cautious and he cannot do otherwise than admit that Bernard 'implies that the best and most sincere cluniac is a less faithful follower of Christ than the average cistercian'¹²⁶.

This extraordinary devotion to the order of Cîteaux is perhaps best demonstrated in the letter which he wrote to the bishop of Lincoln explaining that one of his clerics, who had originally set out on a

pilgrimage to Jerusalem, was now a Cistercian monk: he equated Clairvaux with Jerusalem and wrote that the Lincoln cleric 'speedily crossed this great and spacious sea and successfully navigating has already reached the hoped-for shore and landed at the port of salvation'¹²⁷. Other forms of the monastic life might well exist, but in the last analysis Bernard would always consider that of Cîteaux superior to any other, Cluny included; and the relative proximity of the two houses and the possibility of local, feudal, and familial entanglements between them must also be weighed in any evaluation of either Bernard's or Peter's remarks. There is considerable evidence to indicate that hostilities may have been to some extent provoked by local, almost domestic considerations of this sort. Bligny has already highlighted the struggle for influence in the region of the Alps amongst Cluniacs, Carthusians, and Cistercians; on territory even nearer home conflicts were of a more complex nature and it is only recently that work has begun on the process of placing the Cluny - Cîteaux friction in a local as well as a more general 'ideological' context¹²⁸.

Cîteaux, and Bernard, were incensed by the intervention of Peter the Venerable in the election of a bishop to the diocese of Langres following the death in 1136 of Guilencus. It is difficult to estimate the precise degree of animosity engendered by this affair: but when we take into consideration the links which existed not only between Cîteaux and the diocese of Langres, but also between Molesme, Langres, and Tescelin the Red, the lord of Fontaine-lès-Dijon and father of St Bernard, the anger of the Cistercians at the intrusion of an unworthy Cluniac into the episcopate is even more understandable.

At this period, monks often played an important role in episcopal elections: and this was one area which the Cistercians considered their own. The Cluniacs cannot have been well pleased on their part at the intervention of Bernard and the election of a Cistercian to the episcopate in 1139¹²⁹. Another local conflict was the one which arose in the early 1130s between the Cistercian abbey of Le Miroir and the Cluniac priory of Gigny over the matter of tithes. The affair dragged on into the 1150s and involved not only the two congregations but even, eventually, the papacy¹³⁰.

Nevertheless, despite the existence of such stimuli to conflict, relations between Cluny and Cîteaux were not always hostile. Peter the Venerable and Bernard had always addressed each other in terms of

friendship or, at least, sincere admiration; and the two were undoubtedly drawn into closer harmony by the reforms which Peter carried out at Cluny. Bernard wrote to Pope Eugenius III in or about 1152 that Peter supported the cause of the Cistercians 'in as much as he can with the consent of his own people' and desired to resign as abbot of Cluny. Of Peter's character, Bernard said that:

I believe that he has become more devout than usual and more perfect since you saw him, although he is known almost since he became abbot to have improved that order in many ways, such as observance of fasts, silence, and valuable and curious clothing.¹³¹

These more cordial relations probably account for the virtual cessation on Bernard's part of attacks on Cluny. The so-called Cluniac-Cistercian controversy died out during his lifetime; perhaps it was in reaction to Bernard's increasing restraint that one outburst in the old manner - the Dialogue between a Cluniac and a Cistercian - flared up after his death¹³². The Exordium Magnum also indulges in controversy, suggesting that the reasons for the original departure from Molesme had included its Cluniac decadence¹³³, an allegation which finds no place in either the Exordium Parvum (which does, however, make something of the 'decadence' of traditional monasticism) the Carta Caritatis prior, or the Exordium Cistercii¹³⁴.

Was Conrad of Eberbach, the author of the Exordium Magnum, the first historian to be affected by the polemic of Bernard? He was certainly not the last; and the discrepancy between his and earlier Cistercian 'histories' demonstrates how another myth surrounding the monastic life of the eleventh and twelfth centuries has come into being. The traditional picture of Cluny is built on an insufficient consideration of an insufficient number of sources; and although we are still some distance from achieving a full picture of events, or even a consensus of opinion on the subject, the myth of a decadent twelfth-century Cluny is fast disappearing.

C (iii) John of Matera

The last component of Leclercq's case which demands analysis is the life of John of Matera whom Leclercq instances as one of the monastic founders who departed for the 'desert' in reaction to the 'crisis of prosperity' which was afflicting the Benedictine houses of

the time¹³⁵. John, whose life spanned the later eleventh century and the first three decades of the twelfth, established the congregation of Pulsano in the Monte Gargano area of southern Italy: in common with the other orders founded around this time, it laid great stress on the preservation of monastic poverty. The monks of Pulsano ate neither meat nor milk and eventually refused to wear shoes.

According to Leclercq, one of the decisive factors in John's life was the treatment which he received at the hands of the monks of a house which is described by Leclercq as one of the great Benedictine houses of southern Italy; and if this were the case, the concept of a reaction against excessive worldliness would be demonstrated in at least this one instance. John was sent to look after the animals and, in contrast to the luxurious meals enjoyed by the other monks, he received only stale bread and was despised for his obvious piety. This tale, as Leclercq himself suggests, smacks of the topos; but he does not reject it as John's life was composed by a contemporary and might therefore be supposed to be reasonably accurate¹³⁶. But, on closer examination, the story of John's maltreatment and departure from his first monastery loses much of the significance: the house in which his maltreatment is alleged to have taken place was not one of the 'great abbeys' of southern Italy, but an unnamed foundation on the insula Tarentina¹³⁷. Yet another piece of the material from which Leclercq has attempted to create his thesis of decline and decadence has turned into ammunition which helps to destroy it.

The more closely one looks for a 'crisis of prosperity' in the monasteries of the eleventh century, the more elusive this concept appears. None of the evidence advanced by Leclercq gives any reliable indication that Cluny, or indeed any of the other great Benedictine houses had relaxed their standards to such an extent that reaction was inevitable. Of Cluny itself, contemporaries spoke highly. Gregory VII declared that:

.....among all the abbeys beyond the alps, there shines first and foremost that of Cluny, under the protection of the Holy See. Under its saintly abbots it has reached so high a stage of honour and religion that, because of the zeal wherewith God is there served, without doubt it surpasses all other, even the most ancient¹³⁸. /monasteries,

Pope Galasius II(1118-19)who died and was buried at Cluny denied that the customs of Cluny - often seen as symptoms of decadence - represented any relaxation of the monastic vows:

There are written also in the Rule of the blessed Benedict some observances of this sort which have long been performed otherwise in the monastery, but which should not be interpreted as a weakness on the part of the monastic order¹³⁹.

Robert of Arbrissel who, if Leclercq's theories were correct, would have displayed a stand-offish attitude towards Cluny, made a speech shortly before his death in 1117 in which he ranked Cluny among Christendom's holiest places. 'What wise man', he asked, 'would dare to disparage the supreme monastery of Cluny where, by the grace of God, so much good work is done each day?'¹⁴⁰ Basil, the saintly prior of La Chartreuse and himself a former Cluniac wrote in 1151 to Peter the Venerable that:

The order of Cluny, the discipline of Cluny, the honourable and loveable community of Cluny, as I truly profess, has always incited me to a better and stricter life, and it certainly incites me still¹⁴¹.

And contemporary aspirants to the monastic life certainly showed no signs of turning away from Cluniac houses whose influence 'lasted until at least the last quarter of the twelfth century, when it declined with that of Benedictine monasticism generally.'

Not only does a consideration of contemporary evidence other than the highly biased sources quoted by Leclercq contradict his picture of spiritual decline and moral decay, but we are now in the fortunate position of being in possession of recent research by historians such as Constable, Baker, and Bredero. Nevertheless, only Baker has attempted any form of direct reply to Leclercq, and the work of historians who are broadly in agreement with Leclercq such as Southern, Lekai and Lackner, still exerts considerable influence. It will take some time before the myth of the 'crisis of prosperity' finally fades away; but we are now in a position where we can begin to replace it with something more positive. It is now possible, for instance, to point to and therefore eliminate the preconception which has governed many of our assumptions about the new orders: the see-saw theory which equates their rise with an inevitable decline amongst the Benedictines.

The movement for reform within Cluny itself and the network of friendship and association between old and new houses demonstrate the strong element of continuity in the monastic life of the eleventh and

twelfth centuries. And here, as in the development of the new orders, local and regional circumstances clearly had an important part to play. John of Matera was at one time associated with another Italian monastic founder, William of Vercelli, and the influence of the one on the other still remains to be investigated. The circumstances of the church in Ravenna and the state of monastic life there clearly influenced, for some reason as yet undiagnosed, the thinking of important reformers such as Romuald and Damian. And the great houses of Cluny and Cîteaux are emerging in a new light: no longer do they appear simply as the heads of two great warring factions within the monastic life. They can also be seen in their Burgundian context, in which friendships, rivalries, and occasionally outright confrontation were produced by the elaborate system of inter-relationships, patronage, and commercial interests which bound them into a troubled and still-developing frontier society.

D Recent developments in historical research

The patterns of historical research in recent years have increasingly tended to underline the validity of an approach to problems at a local level. Adapting a sentence from Jane Austen - indeed transforming it - a recent contributor to Studies in Church History has affirmed that 'It is a truth universally acknowledged that the practise of religion will be influenced by the social conditions prevailing in any given locality'¹⁴². Many of the papers in the same volume exemplify this belief, examining religion in its local context in regions as diverse as fourteenth-century Carlisle, Byzantine Africa, and the Touraine between the fourth and seventh centuries¹⁴³. In these circumstances it is inevitable that, despite the predominance of Leclercq and his followers in the field, the origins and development of the new orders have begun to be examined in the context of the regions and societies which surrounded them. The standpoint of Ernst Werner's Pauperes Christi, which appeared two years before 'The Monastic Crisis' is uncompromisingly Marxist. The origins of the eremitical movements of the eleventh and early twelfth century can only be seen, he insists, from an economic basis and he rejects the idea that either a reaction against monastic decadence or influences from outside western Europe can have played anything more than a secondary part in precipitating the eremitical movement in north-western France of which he makes a

short study¹⁴⁴.

The borders of Maine, Anjou, and Brittany were heavily forested and generally unsuitable for agriculture; the great landowners exercised little influence over much of the area; and the juridical status of the peasant was better in Brittany than in other parts of France. Moreover, the area studied by Werner was dotted with bourgs, and criss-crossed by Roman roads; as Vitalis of Mortain was to discover (although Werner does not deal with this in the same detail as Buhot) an eremitical community could go on to expand greatly from this not unadvantageous basis. Even although feudal lords could sometimes make difficulties for the heads of communities others were co-operative and the hermits found conditions favourable enough to settle; and in their wake came genuine followers, vagabonds, and peasants seeking freedom. The construction of churches may also have attracted workmen; Werner quotes Orderic Vitalis on the community of Tiron:

To him Bernard came freely builders, woodcarvers, workers in iron, sculptors, goldsmiths, painters, and plasterers.....they worked carefully and profited from helping the community.

The hospices set up by the hermits also provided focuses for economic activity¹⁴⁵.

The situation on the borders of Maine, Brittany, and Anjou was particularly favourable to the establishment of hermits and semi-eremitic communities, offering as it did both the solitude which they desired but also a reasonable network of communications, proximity to small centres of commerce, the bourgs, and the opportunity for obtaining rights to land which was considered too poor or too remote for cultivation by the secular landlords. That this particular area of north-western France became a second Thebaid is hardly surprising: and it attracted men of the calibre of Robert of Arbrissel, Peter de Stella, Bernard of Tiron and Vitalis of Mortain as well as thousands of unknown men and women.

Werner also seeks to differentiate between the background and economic approach of his hermits and that of the great houses such as Citeaux; and he points to the common Wanderprediger background of some of the most distinguished hermit leaders¹⁴⁶. But there can be little doubt that his most valuable contribution to the study of these hermits and the communities which grew up about them is his staunch insistence on viewing them in a local perspective. Even although his

section on the hermits of north-western France forms a comparatively short section of Pauperes Christi, we are indebted to him for treating these relatively orthodox manifestations on the same socio-economic basis which he applies to the heresies and marginal movements of the period. While it is true that other historians have applied local or regional perspectives to the new orders, it is to Marxists such as Werner that we should attribute the original opening up of any social or economic discussion of the localities. Previously, this field had been abandoned either to the antiquarian or the local historian who was primarily (and sometimes exclusively) concerned with his own area; but few historians today would be content, thanks to the contribution of Werner and other like-minded academics, to accept this traditional distribution of spheres of influence. 'It is a truth universally acknowledged.....'

Given the current climate of opinion on the desirability of research on the society and economy; the exposure of the myth of decline in the older form of monasticism; and the indications that local factors played an important role in the new houses from northern England to Burgundy to Italy, one must conclude that the time for a great number of investigations of the kind undertaken by Werner is ripe. (This is not to say that there has not been a strong continuing tradition of local studies, but rather that they have seldom moved beyond the particular delineation to the broader consideration of the types of life and the motives implied in them. Holdsworth, in a recent paper in History Today, indicates the way ahead in this respect)¹⁴⁷.

The strongly regional character of the eremitic movement in France - the Maine-Anjou-Brittany border and central-southern France, the 'pays de saints' are the most obvious examples of this - further underlines this impression. But work in this direction has proceeded comparatively slowly. One reason for this is, of course, the influence of the Leclercquian thesis of decline, which sought to explain the emergence and even the evolution of the new orders by one sweeping generalisation.

But yet another insurmountable barrier ~~barrier~~ has gradually settled itself across the perspective of the historian of the new monastic orders. We are dealing here with the emergence of a theory which has not only attracted the attention of many historians but which is also directly linked with one of the key areas for the development of the new orders - the Limousin - and has consequently diverted attention which might otherwise have been profitably focussed on the region

itself. Almost every historian of the new orders has paid lip-service to the idea that their origins derived, at least in part, from the influence of the Greek church and, since the appearance from the 1950s onwards of the work of Becquet on the order of Grandmont, this influence has been defined more specifically as that of the Greek monks of southern Italy. Anyone wishing to try the regional approach to the study of the new orders, especially the new orders in the Limousin, must first assess this question of southern Italian influence.

E Orthodox influence - the theory

The probability of the influence of orthodox monasticism on the new orders is acknowledged by several historians of the subject: Werner is the main exception to this rule. There are many circumstances to recommend this view. The orthodox monks of Calabria, Apulia, and Lucania interpreted the gospel with the same literalness as did the western advocates of the apostolic life; and the mobility of the monks of southern Italy - whether we believe that this was originally the result of Arab incursions, or of the iconoclastic movement, or simply by the desire for a solitary and relatively unstable life - bears a strong resemblance to that of some of the most famous exponents of the 'new' monasticism such as Robert of Arbrissel and Bernard of Tiron.

The idea that western Europe was subject to external influences has been further reinforced by the almost universal belief in the connections between the Cathar heresy of northern Italy and southern France and the Bogomils of Bulgaria: even Moore who seeks to explain earlier heretical movements in a purely western social and ecclesiastical context is in agreement with this theory of eastern influence¹⁴⁸. There is - we are told - considerable evidence for the existence of contacts between Greek and Latin monasticism even before the mid-eleventh century. Monte Cassino and the Lombard duchy of Benevento played important roles in sustaining east-west connections; St Nilus sang the office in Greek in the basilica at Cassino, and St John of Gorze visited Benevento and Monte Gargano around 933. Monte Gargano, situated in one of the Greek areas of southern Italy was an important centre of pilgrimage; and it was possible for pilgrims to the Holy Land to pass through areas like this where it was the Orthodox form of monasticism which prevailed. Personnel passed in the opposite

direction and one or two Greek monks, including a pauper Ursus, natione Beneventanus could be found in eleventh-century Lotharingia¹⁴⁹.

Contacts of this sort, of which there are many more examples, must be seen against the background of contacts between Byzantium and the west in general: the influence of Theophano on the court of Otto III; the influence of Byzantine artists and craftsmen on their western counterparts; diplomatic relations between east and west, including the episode of Liutprand's legation to Constantinople; and the relations between the pope and the patriarch of Constantinople especially in view of the events of 1054. But it must be asked whether the specifically monastic contacts between east and west were sufficiently profound or sustained to have any lasting influence. The answer to this question is very possibly in the negative: but with the appearance of Becquet's work on Stephen of Muret we appear to have one clear and decisive example of Byzantine influence on western monasticism which stands out from all the other instances of contact which are usually considered in this connection.

Yet the concept of the exchange of influence between Byzantium and the west is itself increasingly coming under fire. In his article on eastern and western Christendom in late antiquity Peter Brown has warned us against the tendency of scholars:

to treat Byzantium as a world apart, standing aside and above the destinies of an 'underdeveloped' western Europe. Once this view is accepted, the east tends to be treated as a distinct and enclosed reservoir of superior culture, from which the occasional stream is released, to pour downhill - by some obscure law of cultural hydraulics - to water the lower reaches of the west. Relations between east and west, therefore, tend to be treated as so many 'releases' of Byzantine 'influence'¹⁵⁰

These remarks apply equally well to the eleventh and twelfth centuries; and Bryer, writing of the twelfth century itself, concludes that 'Unless they felt threatened, Greek and Latin were still basically incurious of each other'¹⁵¹. The concept of Byzantine 'influence' runs counter to one of the most profitable lines of investigation open to historians of western Europe; and it is also evident that, in the opinion of two of our most eminent Byzantinists, it goes severely against the grain. There could be no clearer invitation to re-open the case of Stephen of Muret, the Order of Grandmont, and the concept of

Byzantine influence upon the new monastic orders of the eleventh and twelfth centuries.



Notes Part I

1. See initially Jean Becquet, Scriptores Ordinis Grandimontensis, Corpus Christianorum (Continuatio Medieualis VIII) (Turnhout, 1963). This is an edition of a number of the earliest Grandmontine texts but one with no historical introduction and little in the way of commentary on the texts themselves. The reader is simply advised to read earlier articles, mainly by Becquet himself. These are: 'Les premiers écrivains de l'Ordre de Grandmont', RM XLIII (1953) pp 121-37; Bibliothèque des écrivains de l'Ordre de Grandmont', ibid LIII (1963) pp 59-69; 'Etienne de Muret', DS IV (1961) cols 1504-14; 'La règle de Grandmont', BSAHL LXXXVII (1958-60) pp 9-36; 'La première crise de l'Ordre de Grandmont', ibid pp 283-324; 'La liturgie de l'Ordre de Grandmont', Ephimerides Liturgicae LXXVI (1962) pp 146-61. Of his articles on the origins of Grandmont and the career of Stephen of Muret, the most important is not, in fact, any of these, but 'Saint Etienne de Muret et l'archevêque de Bénévent Milon', BSAHL LXXXVI (1957) pp 403-9. Also relevant are: 'Etienne de Muret', DHGE 15 cols 1252-3; 'L' "institution", premier coutumier de l'Ordre de Grandmont', BSAHL XLVI (1956) pp 15-32; and 'Les institutions de l'Ordre de Grandmont au Moyen Age', RM XLII (19 2).
2. C. Dereine, 'L' obituaire primitif de l'Ordre de Grandmont', BSAHL LXXXVII (1958-60) pp 325-331.
3. C. Dereine, 'Les origines de Prémontré', RHE XLII (1947) pp 325-78; 'Vie commune, Règle de Saint Augustin et chanoines réguliers au XI Siècle', RHE XLI (1946) pp 365-406; and 'La spiritualité "Apostolique" des premiers fondateurs d' Afflighem (1083-1100)' RHE LIV (1959) pp 41-65.
4. B. Bligny, Recueil des plus anciens actes de la Grande Chartreuse (1036-1196) (Grenoble, 1958) and 'Les premiers Chartreux et la pauvreté', Le Moyen Age 57 (1951) pp 27-60; A. de Meyer and J. de Smet, Guigo's "Consuetudines" van die eerste Kartuizens (Brussels, 1951).
5. J.-B. Mahn, L'Ordre Cistercien et son Gouvernement des Origines au milieu du XIII siècle (1093-1265) (2nd ed Paris, 1951); J. Turk, 'Cistercii statuta antiquissima', Analecta Sacri Ordinis

- Cistercensis 4 (1948) pp 1-59; J. Leclercq, 'Une ancienne redaction des coutumes cisterciennes' RHE XLVII (1952) pp 172-6; id, 'L' Exordium Cistercii et la Summa Cartae Caritatis sont-ils de saint Bernard?' RB 73 (1963) pp 83-89; id, 'Passage supprimé dans une épître d' Alexandre III' RB 62 (1952) pp 149-51; 'Epître d' Alexandre III sur les Cisterciens' RB 64 (1954). The most famous and controversial name in recent studies on the Cistercians is undoubtedly that of J.-A. Lefèvre, who wrote a series of articles which raised doubt about the traditional dating of the earliest Cistercian documents. Among them are 'Le vrai recit des origines de Cîteaux, est-il l'Exordium Parvum?', Le Moyen Age LXI (1955) pp 70-120, 329-61 and 'Que savons-nous du Cîteaux primitif?' RHE LI (1956) pp 5-41. Pro-Lefèvre is E. Werner's 'Neue Texte und Forschungen zur Charta Charitatis' Forschungen und Fortschritte 29 (1955) pp 25-9. See also R. Folz, 'Le problème des origines de Cîteaux' Mélanges S Bernard pp 234-94. For further discussion and bibliography on Cîteaux see notes 124a, 133, 134 below.
6. J.C. Dickinson, The Origins of the Austin Canons (London, 1950).
 7. See in particular Bernard Hamilton, 'S Pierre Damien et les mouvements monastique de son temps' Studi Gregoriani X (Rome, 1975) pp 175-202; G. Tabacco, 'Romualdo di Ravenna e gli inizi dell' eremitismo camaldolese', L' Eremitismo in Occidente nei Secoli XI e XII (Miscellanea del Centro di Studi Medioevali IV) (Milan, 1963) pp 73-121; Ovidio Capitani, 'S Pier Damiani e l' istituto eremitico' *ibid*, pp 122-63.
 8. For the papers, see note 7 above.
 9. H. Grundmann, Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter (2nd ed, Hildesheim, 1961).
 10. E. Werner, Pauperes Christi, Studien zu Sozial-Religiöse Bewegungen im Zeitalter des Reformspapsttums (Leipzig, 1956).
 11. M.-D. Chenu, La Théologie au Douzième Siècle (Paris, 1957).
 12. J. Leclercq, 'La crise du monachisme au XI et XII siècles', BISI-MEAM 70 (1958) pp 19-41. For another general view, but one which

seems to be much less discussed than that of Leclercq - at least in my experience - see N. Cantor, 'The Crisis of monasticism 1050-1130' AHR 66 (1960) pp 47-67.

13. The Life of Bernard of Tiron with its famous descriptions of the way of life of the hermits can be found in PL 172 cols 1363-1446.
14. Perhaps caution should be exercised here, as some recent work suggests that too much emphasis has been placed on Robert's provision for women, thus distorting our overall view of his work. See J. Smith, 'Robert of Arbrissel: Procurator Mulierum', SCH Subsidia I, Medieval Women (London, 1978) pp 175-84.
15. See Giles Constable, Monastic Tithes from their Origins to the Twelfth Century (Cambridge, 1964), especially pp 99-185 and pp 220-306.
16. Scriptores 1, prefatory chapter, p 5. Gerald's remarks on the Grandmontines occur in his Speculum Ecclesiae, Opera, ed J. Brewer, J.F. Dimock, and G.F. Warner, Rolls Series (London 1861-91), vol IV p 256 (= Book 3 cap 21).
17. Some of these questions were raised originally in 1955 - see Grundmann, Religiöse Bewegungen (2nd ed, 1961) pp 487-93 - but we are still some way from being able to answer them all.
18. See Chenu, La Théologie, especially pp 225 ff. On a less general level than Chenu, but also dealing with spirituality (popular spirituality in this case) see E. Delaruelle, 'La pietà popolare nel secolo XI', Relazioni del X Congresso Internazionale di Scienze Storiche III: Storia del Medioevo (Florence, 1955) pp 309-32.
19. Grundmann, Religiöse Bewegungen pp 29-38.
20. Or, rather, the second version of the Life of Stephen would have us believe that his father was viscount of Thiers, whereas the original Life is vague - but still suggests nobility. For the social standing of saints and their families - including monastic saints - see A. Murray, Reason and Society in the Middle Ages (London, 1978) pp 315-415.

21. Grundmann, Religiöse Bewegungen pp 19-23 and Werner, Pauperes Christi pp 30-42.
22. See Derek Baker, 'Reform as protest: the evidence of western eremitical movements' The Church in a Changing Society (Proceedings of the CIHEC conference, Uppsala, 1977) p 56; see also Dereine, 'La Spiritualité "Apostolique" des premiers fondateurs d' Afflighem' p 43 note 1.
23. See page 33 above.
24. The possibility of the existence of eastern influence on the new orders is a concept which tends to arise frequently in discussion and which has been mentioned en passant by a number of historians and discussed at length by one or two. It is a concept which Marxists such as Werner (Pauperes Christi pp 28-30) feel bound to reject. It is briefly discussed, however, by D. Knowles, The Monastic Order in England (1950) pp 192-5; J.-B. Mahn, L' Ordre Cistercien pp 26-30; C. Dereine, 'Odon de Tournai et la crise du cénobitisme au XI Siècle' Revue du Moyen Age Latin IV (2) 1948 p 130 and 'La spiritualité "Apostolique" pp 43-4 n 3 where he sums up the effect, for him, of Becquet's studies on Grandmont, which had not yet reached their full development and still seemed to suggest some doubt concerning the nature of Calabrian influence on Stephen. 'Elsewhere,' he writes, 'H. Grundmann thinks (rightly we believe) that J. Becquet has been wrong to put in doubt the exactness of the Calabrian influence signalled in the Life of Stephen Muret (sic).. The thesis of eastern influence through the intermediary of the new orders in Italy seems to take on more and more consistency.' This type of attitude has been reinforced by studies of the kind undertaken by Bernard Hamilton and Patricia McNulty in 'Orientalis lumen et magistra latinitas: Greek influences on Western monasticism (900-1100)', Le Millenaire de Mont Athos (1963-1963) I (Chevetogne, 1963) pp 131-215 and Dom N Huyghebaert, 'Moines et Clercs Italiens en Lotharingie', Annales du 33 congrès de la Fédération Archéologique et Historique de Belgique (Tournai, 1951) pp 95-111.
25. The Life of Stephen of Muret appears in PL 204 cols 1006-1071,

but this edition has been superseded by that of Becquet,
Scriptores 3.

26. The Liber Sententiarum (Scriptores 1) should perhaps be known by its implied primitive title of the Liber de Doctrina, especially as a Liber Sententiarum is ascribed to Bernard of Clairvaux. However, use of both titles avoids repetition.
27. For the Rule of Grandmont see Becquet, Scriptores 2 and Becquet's article 'La Règle de Grandmont' BSHAL LXXXVII (1953-60) pp 9-36. For the genesis of the first three Grandmontine works, the Liber the Rule and the Life of Stephen see also Becquet, 'Les premiers écrivains de l' Ordre de Grandmont' RM XLIII (1953) pp 121-37. Both the Life and the Liber de Doctrina will be dealt with at some length in Parts II and III.
28. Leclercq, 'La crise' p 34.
29. Knowles, Monastic Order p 352.
30. *ibid* p 197.
31. J. Leclercq, 'La poème de Payen Bolotin contre les Faux Ermites' RB 68 (1968) pp 52-86. The quotation is given by Leclercq in 'La crise' p 30.
32. Orderic Vitalis, Ecclesiastical History ed M. Chibnall (Oxford, 1973) vol 4 Book 8 pp 212-3 calls the poem 'a beautiful song in adonic metre in which he exposed the covert superstition of their hypocrisy subtly and at length'.
33. Leclercq, 'Epîtres d' Alexandre III' pp 72-3 note 5.
34. Gerald of Wales, Speculum Ecclesiae p 256.
35. See both Leclercq, 'Epîtres d' Alexandre III' p 73 and Leclercq, 'La crise' p 34.
36. Leclercq, 'Epîtres d' Alexandre III' p 73.
37. Leclercq, 'La crise' p 40.

38. Jacqueline Buhot, 'L'abbaye normande de Savigny, chef d' ordre et fille de Cîteaux', Le Moyen Age 3rd series 7 (1936) pp 1-20 esp p 7.
39. *ibid* p 12. The quotation is from Orderic Vitalis, Ecclesiastical History vol 4 pp 332-3.
40. See Leclercq, 'La crise' pp 40-1.
41. Constable, Monastic Tithes p 133.
42. *ibid* p 132.
43. *ibid* p 192 and p 191 for Camp and tithes.
44. E. Hoffmann, 'Die Entwicklung der Wirtschaftsprinzipien im Cisterzienserorden während des 12 und 13 Jahrhunderts', Historisches Jahrbuch XXXI (1910) pp 700 ff.
45. Constable, Monastic Tithes pp 190-1.
46. Derek Baker, 'Crossroads and crises in the religious life of the later eleventh century' SCH 16 (1979) pp 137-43; the quotation comes from pp 142-3.
47. Dereine, 'La spiritualité "Apostolique"' pp 41-65.
48. *ibid* p 61.
49. For all these see notes 30-40 above.
50. Knowles, Monastic Order p 662.
51. *ibid* p 663-3.
52. *ibid*.
53. *ibid* p 675.
54. *ibid* pp 677-3.

55. *ibid* p 352.
56. Leclercq, 'Payen Bolotin' esp pp 63-75.
57. W. Meyer, 'Zwei Gedichte zur Geschichte des Cisterciense. Ordens' Nachrichten der königliche Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Klasse (1903) pp 386-95.
58. Leclercq, 'Payen Bolotin' pp 70-1.
59. *ibid* p 71.
61. *ibid* p 72.
61. *ibid* p 73.
62. Beryl Smalley, 'Ecclesiastical attitudes to novelty c 1100 - c 1250' SCH 12 (1975) pp 113-31; the quotation comes from p 119.
63. See note 33 above.
64. *ibid* p 73 note 2.
65. Paul Viard, Histoire de la dîme ecclésiastique principalement en France, jusqu'au Decret de Gratien (Dijon, 1909) p 202.
66. Libellus de Diversis Ordinibus et Professionibus qui sunt in Aecclesia edited and translated by G. Constable and B. Smith (Oxford, 1972).
67. Edited by G. Salet as Renouveau dans l' Eglise, Sources Chretiennes vol 113 (Paris, 1966).
68. Libellus introduction p xxiii.
69. *ibid* pp 73-97.
70. *ibid* p 23.
- 70a. See note 63 above for Anselm's Dialogues.
71. Both groups are mentioned in the Libellus, the first in Part Two, the second in Part Five.
72. See note 16 above.

73. See Ganshof's remarks in the Cambridge Economic History vol I pp 313-4.
74. See Buhot, 'Savigny' pp 7 and 12.
75. See Dereine, 'La spiritualité "Apostolique" pp 56-62 esp.
76. Derek Baker, 'Popular piety in the Lodèvois in the early twelfth century: the case of Pons de Lèras' SCH 15 (1978) pp 39-47.
77. For both see Baker, 'Crossroads and crises' pp 142-3.
78. Derek Baker, 'Patronage in the early twelfth-century church: Walter Espec, Kirkham and Rievaulx' Traditio - Krisis - Renovatio aus theologischer Sicht. Festschrift Winfried Zeller (Marburg, 1976) pp 92-100.
79. See A. Mouraux, 'La vie apostolique à propos de Rupert de Deutz' Revue Liturgique et Monastique XXI (1931) pp 71-8, 125-41.
80. M.-H. Vicaire L'imitation des apôtres: moines, chanoines, mendiants (IV-XIII siècles) (Paris, 1963) stresses the aspect of preaching in the vita apostolica.
81. Chenu, La Théologie pp 225-51 and Leclercq, La Spiritualité de Pierre de Celle (Paris, 1946) pp 127-30 both emphasise, in contrast to Vicaire, the importance of poverty rather than preaching, as does E. W. McDonnell, 'The Vita Apostolica: Diversity or Dissent', Church History 24 (1955) pp 15-31.
82. For Bernard's criticisms of Cluny see in particular his De praeecepto et dispensatione 46 in Opera ed Leclercq vol III p 285.
83. The Letters of Peter the Venerable (ed Constable II) 180-1, 189 and 198 indicate that he had friends among the Cistercians and that a member of his family was a Cistercian. Bernard himself was to number Peter amongst the list of prominent abbots whom he favoured with his friendship; and Baker, 'Crossroads and crises' has suggested that the network of family ties which bound members of Cluny, Clairvaux and Cîteaux together might be further investigated for the light which they might throw on the complex question

- of relations between the houses. J. Wollasch, 'Neue Quellen zur Geschichte der Cisterciensier' Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte LXXXIV (1973) pp 183-232 demonstrates that in Cistercian necrologies and acts of association the houses most often mentioned are those of Molesme, Cluny and La Chartreuse.
84. See Peter the Venerable, Letters (ed Constable I) 366 and 373.
85. See the contribution of Jean de la Croix Bouton in Bernard de Clairvaux, Commission d'histoire de l'Ordre de Cîteaux 3 (Paris, 1953) pp 239-40 and 245-6.
86. These passages occur in the Apologia, Opera ed Leclercq vol III pp 84-9. This quotation is also used by Giles Constable in a discussion on Bernard's views on the variety of the religious life, 'St Bernard and the Diversity of forms of the Religious Life in the Twelfth Century' Studi su San Bernardo di Chiaravalle, Bibliotheca Cistercensis 6 (Rome, 1975) pp 93-114, which was of great help in this discussion.
87. See not only Constable (note 86 above) but also the remarks of Dom A. Dimier in 'Saint Bernard et le droit en matiere de transitus' RM XLIII (1953) p 80 - Bernard was sometimes 'not far from thinking "No salvation outside Cîteaux"!'
88. Constable, 'St Bernard and the Diversity' p 97.
89. *ibid.*
90. See particularly the contribution of Leclercq 'D' érémitisme en occident jusqu' a l' an mil', L' Eremitismo pp 27-44.
91. Germain Morin, 'Rainaud l' ermite et Ives de Chartres: un episode de la crise du cénobitisme au XI-XII siècle' RB 40 (1923) pp 99-115.
92. Leclercq, 'La crise' p 20.
93. *ibid* pp 31-2.
94. Baker, 'Crossroads and crises' p 138.

95. Leclercq, 'La crise' p 22. The original is in Latin.
96. *ibid.*
97. *ibid* pp 24-5.
98. Peter Damian, De fuga dignitatum ecclesiasticarum, PL 145 cols 457-60.
99. Peter Damian, Vita Beati Romualdi ed G. Tabacco, Fonti per la storia d'Italia 94 (Rome, 1957).
100. Bernard Hamilton, 'S. Pierre Damien et les mouvements monastiques de son temps', Studi Gregoriani X (1975) pp 175-202, quotation from p 188.
101. See in particular O.J. Blum, St Peter Damian and His Teaching on the Spiritual Life (Washington, 1947) - chapters one and two detail Peter's career and indicate his reluctance to become a public figure.
102. Peter Damian still remains a problematic figure although there is a considerable amount of fairly recent literature on his life and thought. Of this, see J. Leclercq, S Pierre Damien, ermite et homme d'église (Rome, 1960); G. Miccoli, 'Théologie de la vie monastique chez S Pierre Damien' Théologie de la vie monastique (Paris, 1961); and especially the stimulating article by Ovidio Capitani, 'San Pier Damiani e l' istituto eremitico' L' Eremitismo pp 122-59. This last piece is particularly successful, or so it seems to me, in highlighting the difficulties involved in coming to terms with the place of Damian in the history of eremitic and cenobitic institutions (see pp 123-8). It is Capitani who points to Peter's willingness to admit postulants to the eremitical life without a period of preparation in a cenobium and this in defiance of traditional practise; and he eventually concludes that Peter wished to find spiritual values:

espressi ed inespressi nel solco della tradizione:
una tradizione per altro che in Pier Damiani
trovava di preferenza una sua costante matrice
nella regola di S Benedetto. E' difficile dire
allo stato attuale delle *ricerche* se questo
riferimento più frequente potesse avere un valore
polemico nei riguardi del cenobitismo.....(p 159)

Peter's view would seem to be much less straightforward and more difficult to assess than Leclercq would have us believe; and Capitani's suggestions are borne out by some of the details of Peter's life to which Leclercq does not refer. Peter was impressed by Cluny under St Hugh and would send his nephew Damian to study there, despite a rather unfavourable initial impression of the house. (see Letters PL 144 cols 373 and 380). Leclercq's presentation of Peter as an anti-Benedictine polemicist is somewhat forced - elsewhere in the same article he concedes that Peter himself belongs to the Benedictine tradition - and this is a debatable point - and reminds us that he remained on friendly terms with not only Hugh but also Desiderius and Guy of Pomposa, finally declaring that he 'admired but did not wish to imitate'. Leclercq's argument seems to be unbalanced because of his desire to force Peter into the position of critic: cf. also his book on Peter.

103. John of Fécamp has been treated also by Leclercq, in conjunction with J.-P. Bonnes, Jean de Fécamp: un maître de la vie spirituelle au XI siècle (Paris, 1946). The quotation from his letter Tuae quidem is cited there at p 202. Hamilton, 'S Pierre Damien' p 199 notes that the name of Mayeul is a later interpolation and that we do not know whom John of Fecamp originally named. The name of Mayeul lends the text as quoted in Leclercq, 'La crise' the misleading impression of being directed at specifically Cluniac decadence.
104. See G. Tellenbach, ed, Neue Forschungen über Cluny und die Cluniacenser von Joachim Wollasch, Hans-Erich Meyer und Hermann Dreuer (Freiburg, 1959) pp 230 ff for the prosperity of Cluny under the great abbots of the tenth and eleventh centuries. Mayeul, like Hugh, was noted not only for the material prosperity which he brought to Cluny but also for his piety. His friendship with the Ottonian house and his zest for building may appear worldly but their conjunction with piety and reforming zeal did not appear incongruous in their own day. Like Hugh, Mayeul was honoured with the title of saint: see J. Evans, Monastic Life at Cluny (Oxford, 1931) pp 15-7 for his work of reform and restoration, his refusal of the papal tiara and his tomb as a place of pilgrimage.

105. For the letter see IS II (Venice, 1717) cols 355-9. The group of hermits whom Leo addresses also use Benedict and Leo also suggested that they base their practise on the Acta of SS Saba and Euthymius. Hamilton and McNulty, 'Orientale lumen' p 213 refer to Tuae Ouidem and do not appear to have found in it any condemnation of Benedictinism either. Leo, like Peter Damian, Romuald, and John of Fécamp seems simply to have placed a high value on the eremitical life.
106. Leclercq, 'La crise' p 25.
107. At the same time, Peter complained of the length of the offices at Cluny. PL 145 cols 873 ff.
108. PL 144 col c30.
109. Leclercq, 'La crise' p 30.
110. A. Fliche, Histoire de l' Eglise IX (Paris, 1948) pp 114-5: 'L' ordre a eu de la peine a se remettre a la crise qui avait suivé la mort de saint Hugue et dont l' abbé Pons est pour une large partie responsable'. Cf. U. Berlière, 'Les origines de Cîteaux et l'ordre bénédictin au XII siècle' RB II (1901) p 470: 'le premier soin (of Peter the Venerable) avait été de déraciner les principaux abus introduits dans sa communauté par son indigne predecesseur, l'abbé Pons'.
111. De Miraculis II cap XII, PL 139 cols 922-4.
112. Orderic Vitalis, Ecclesiastical History, PL 135 cols 894-5.
113. Bernard, Apologia c 27 Opera ed Leclercq, vol III p 103.
114. See H.V. White, 'Pontius of Cluny, the Curia Romana and the end of Gregorianism in Rome' Church History XXVII (1958) pp 195-219; G. Tellenbach, 'Die Sturz des Abtes Pontius und seine Geschichtliche Bedeutung', OFIAB XLII-III (1964) pp 13-55; and P. Zerbi, 'Intorno alla scisma di Ponzio, abbate di Cluny', Studi Storici in onore di Ottorino Bertolini (Pisa, 1972) pp 835-91.
115. A. Bredero, 'Pierre le Vénérable: les commencements de son abbatiat

- a Cluny (1122-32)', Pierre Abélard, Pierre le Vénérable (Colloques Internationaux du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique n. 546) (Paris, 1975) pp 106-7. For this exceptionally difficult problem and the range of evidence uncovered see also A. Bredero, 'Cluny et Cîteaux au XII siècle: les origines de la controverse' SM 3rd ser., 12 (1971) pp 133-75; id., 'A propos del' autorité abbatiale de Pons de Melgeuil et de Pierre le Vénérable', Etudes de civilisation medievale: Mélanges offerts a E.R. Labande (Poitiers, 1975) pp 63-75; and J. Leclercq, A. Bredero, and P. Zerbi, 'Encore sur Pons de Cluny et Pierre le Vénérable', Aevum XLVIII (1974) pp 139-149.
116. ibid n 46.
117. ibid pp 108-9.
118. ibid pp 110-12.
119. See Bredero's arguments ibid pp 115-6 and also Smalley, 'Ecclesiastical attitudes to novelty' passim.
120. Bredero, 'Pierre le Vénérable' pp 109-10 esp n 53.
121. ibid pp 110-1.
122. Bernard, Apologia c VII, 15. Opera ed Leclercq, vol III, p 94.
123. M. Hunt, Cluny under St Hugh (London, 1967) esp pp 203-7.
124. Bredero, 'Pierre le Vénérable' p 109.
- 124a Perhaps it might be appropriate to mention at this point the resemblance of Cistercian custom to Cluniac: see B. Schneider, 'Cîteaux und die benediktinische Tradition', Analecta Sacri Ordinis Cisterciensis 16 (1960) pp 169-254 and 17 (1961) pp 73-114
125. D. Knowles, Cistercians and Cluniacs: the Controversy between St Bernard and Peter the Venerable (London, 1953) pp 19-20.
126. ibid p 20.
127. Bernard, Letters, Opera ed Mabillon, I, Letter 64 203c - 209a.

128. B. Bligny, 'Un aspect de la vie religieuse au moyen age. La concurrence monastique dans les Alpes au XIIe siècle', Bulletin philologique et historique du Comité des Travaux Historiques et Scientifiques (1951-2) pp 279-87.
129. G. Constable, 'The Disputed Election at Langres in 1133', Traditio XIII (1957) pp 119-52.
130. G. Constable, 'Cluniac Tithes and the Controversy between Gigny and le Miroir', RE LXX (1960) pp 591-624 and Monastic Tithes pp 274-5.
131. Bernard, Letters, Opera I, Letter 277, p 562.
132. For the Dialogue see R. Huygens, 'Le moine Idung et ses deux ouvrages, "Argumentum super quattuor quaestionibus" et "Dialogus duorum monachorum"' SM XIII pp 219-470. The oldest edition of the Dialogue and the only one available to me is in Martène and Durand TMA V (1717) cols 1569-1645. But see also Cistercians and Cluniacs: the Case for Cîteaux (Cistercian Fathers series no 33) (Kalamazoo, 1977). The Dialogue states that Molesme was a Cistercian house, I, 52.
133. Exordium Magnum Cistercense sive Narratio de Initio Cisterciensis ed B. Gnësser (Rome, 1961) p 50.
134. For the Exordium Parvum, the Carta Caritatis Prior and the Exordium Cistercii in translation see J. Lekai, The Cistercians pp 443-61.
135. Leclercq, 'La Crise' pp 31-2.
136. *ibid.*
137. Life of John of Matera, AASS June vol V pp 33-50. See chapter 1 pp 36-8 for John's early life and the story of his maltreatment. The house in which his sufferings took place was probably that of St Peter: see IP 9 pp 440-1. In 1138 it was a Benedictine house.
138. Quoted by Evans, Monastic Life at Cluny p 34.

139. PL 163 col 496.
140. Vita altera Roberti PL 162 col 1073.
141. Quoted by G. Constable, 'The monastic policy of Peter the Venerable' in Pierre Abélard, Pierre le Vénéral p 137.
142. E. Mason, 'A truth universally acknowledged', SCH 16 (1979) pp 171-66, p 171.
143. See SCH 16, papers by R.K. Rose, W. Krend, and C.E. Staniccliffe - and the approach of the book in general in examining local conditions.
144. Werner, Pauperes Christi pp 7-30.
145. *ibid* p 130-45: the quotation comes from p 138.
146. On this aspect, the still-essential work is that of J. von Walter, Die Erste Wandeprediger Frankreichs (2 vols, Leipzig, 1903 and 1906)
147. C. Holdsworth, 'A Cistercian monastery and its neighbours' History Today 30 (1980) viii pp32-7.
148. R.I. Moore, The Birth of European Dissent (London, 1975) - see in particular his chapter on the Cathars (cVII pp 151-96, esp p 172) where he switches from a discussion of 'native' heresies to an acknowledgement of Bogomil influence.
149. For these examples - and more - see Hamilton and McMulty 'Orientale Lumen' and Huyghebaert 'Moines et clercs italiens'.
150. P. Brown, 'Eastern and Western Christendom in Late Antiquity: a Parting of the Ways' SCH 13 (1976) p 5.
151. A. Bryer, 'Cultural Relations between east and west in the twelfth century', Relations Between East and West in the Middle Ages ed D. Baker (Edinburgh, 1973) p 90.

PART II

A INTRODUCTION

In order to understand the nature as opposed to the impact of Becquet's work on the Life of Stephen of Muret, it is now necessary to move from the broader field to one of more detailed investigation and analysis, a task which is rendered unusually complex by the problems presented by the Life itself. To say merely that Becquet is - as one would expect - dependent on earlier historians for much of the material which he presents would be to over-simplify. Taken in isolation the Life of Stephen of Muret has, for three centuries, failed to provide the historian with any real answers to the problems which it itself raises; and so a quite separate body of information has been gradually compiled to remedy its deficiencies. It is this unusually close interaction between the historiographical and historical aspects which dictates the shape of the following pages.

A short bibliography of the early modern versions of the Life will serve to illustrate the uncritical hagiographical milieu in which it first found its way into print. The advent of the Bollandists in the seventeenth century saw, because of their overriding desire for the systematic establishment of the truth, the emergence of a more critical attitude towards the text and, in the form of historical notes on Milo of Benevento, the beginnings of the dossier which was evidently intended to supplement the information contained in the text. In the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century the full critical and analytical zeal of the Maurists was trained upon the subject: not only did they provide the version of the Life most commonly used up the appearance of Becquet's edition of 1967, but they also rejected obviously unreliable evidence. The nineteenth century, by contrast, was to produce little material of interest for the study of the Life, instead it became the property of French and local Limousin historians who used it in their compilations on the Order of Grandmont. Becquet dedicates his own magnum opus, the Scriptores Ordinis Grandimontensis to the Limousin historian Guibert; but in his methods and in the materials which he uses, if not in spirit, he is closer to the Maurists.

The centrepiece of the following section will be formed by a detailed account of the two articles in which Becquet not only discovers the earliest known version of the Life but also sets out to dispel all doubts about its reliability; and this will be followed in turn by an

analysis of his central thesis. It may seem that we are travelling to this latter point by a circuitous route, but it is one which should ultimately provide us not only with a greater understanding of the context in which the Life has been seen from the Bollandists to Becquet, but also with a graphic illustration of the all too thorny problems raised for the historian both by the Life itself and by the work of its editors and commentators.

B (i) The Life and the historians: early printed versions and commentators

The Life of Stephen of Muret made its first appearance in print in the Speculum Historiale (1591) of Vincent of Beauvais; and this edition appears to be taken - as there are several manuscript versions of the Life - from the Speculum Grandimontis, a compilation made under the direction of the seventh prior of Grandmont, Gerard Ithier (1138-93)¹. The same narrative is reproduced in the Chronicorum opus of Antoninus of Florence (Lyons, 1687). In 1647, Father Charles Frémon, the reformer of the Order of Grandmont, produced a French Life of Stephen², claiming that it was based on the text contained in the Speculum Grandimontis: but if this is the case, then the latter must have been adapted very freely, as Frémon's version contains many details which are not to be found in it (or, indeed, in any of the other known manuscript Lives). To put the most charitable construction on the appearance of this work, it could be argued that Frémon, a Grandmontine, possibly had access to traditions preserved within the order; but the adulatory and imprecise nature of several passages which appear here and not in any of the medieval texts must lead us to conclude, with Becquet, that this is 'a work of edification rather than criticism'³, and as such cannot be considered as reliable.

Levesque's Annales Ordinis Grandimontensis (1662) - which was to earn him the title of 'the annalist' in Mabillon and Martène's Veterum Scriptorum - is a slightly more respectable work, reproducing large sections of the Speculum's Life interlaced with Levesque's own historical commentary. Nevertheless, he too is inclined - following an earlier historian of the order, Pardoux de la Garde⁴ - to add unsubstantiated information or information from other sources, to his account of Stephen's life: he not only makes Stephen a member of a noble house

(as does Fremon), but also states that the saint stayed for a short time with St Gaucher of Aureil⁵. Presumably the first of these associations is a development of statements in the Speculum Life to the effect that Stephen's father was viscount of Thiers and in the Life of St Gaucher of Aureil that Stephen was one of his disciples, and built himself a dwelling near Gaucher's community at Aureil⁶. It is Levesque, too, who first mentions a bull in which Gregory VII gives permission for Stephen to found an order of his own; the existence of any such written permission is not mentioned in the Life itself, and we shall hear much of the bull of Gregory VII at a later stage⁷.

Yet it would be wrong to suppose that everyone who read these edifying little works did so in an entirely uncritical spirit. Even within the order of Grandmont itself, one hardy soul displayed a shattering scepticism concerning some of the most fundamental claims of the order. The anonymous author of Les moines empruntez, which appeared in Paris in either 1696 or 1697, took issue with the religious establishment over the questions of whether Stephen of Muret had ever really been a monk, and over one or two minor points concerning the membership of the order in the middle ages. Such attacks could not go unanswered: the first counterblast came only months after the appearance of Les moines empruntez in the form of an anonymous pamphlet probably composed by Henri de la Marche de Parnac, Superior of the Order of Grandmont⁸. At any rate, it was he who, in 1704 published a French Life of Stephen in which the charges made in Les moines are again detailed and - Parnac hopes - refuted. In fact, set beside Parnac's excessive sentimentality ('Pendant que Candide lui preparoit ses petits alimens, Etienne lui insinuoit insensiblement les premiers elements de la Religion, en lui apparant à connoitre et à servir Dieu!')⁹ and his embroiderings which include a more than usually elaborate and quite untraceable genealogy for Stephen, these charges seem comparatively sensible.

We now accept that the Grandmontine Rule was not composed by Stephen himself, and, consequently that he may be regarded as the model for rather than the actual founder of the order. Perhaps the most comical aspect of Parnac's rather laboured defence of tradition is his proud assertion that Mabillon was about to publish the bull of Gregory VII, first referred to by Levesque¹⁰. Publish it he did indeed - only to completely and publicly revise his opinion about its authenticity at a later date.

B (ii) The Life and the historians: the Bollandists

The episode of Les moines empruntez, even if it helps vividly to illustrate the shortcomings of the uncritical hagiography of the early modern period, is a diversion from the main trends of historiography on Grandmont which were just beginning to be established in the seventeenth century. The Bollandists, although clerics themselves, were great debunkers of unfounded traditions; and their Acta Sanctorum, a collection of saints' lives compiled on a calendar basis sought to bring a more rational and scientific approach to hagiography. They made the first really significant contribution to what we may term the 'modern' historiography of the Life of Stephen of Muret: and consequently their labours demand a slightly extended treatment.

The entry for Stephen of Muret in the second February volume of the Acta Sanctorum was compiled - as the marginal initials JE indicate - by Bolland himself¹¹. He printed a version of the Life of Stephen which he believed to be that contained in the Speculum Grandimontis¹², although in this he was in error as the text in question appears to be an adaptation of Gerard Ithier's work. To this version of the vita is appended a translatio and a relevatio (two such narratives were necessary as Stephen's body was moved first from Muret to Grandmont and then exhumed and reburied upon his canonisation) together with a selection of miracles from the French Life by Frémon (only a few of these actually occur in the Speculum Life) and a substantial introductory commentary¹³. This commentary includes an analysis of the defects of the order's constitution - defects which would almost lead to its breakup within the first five or six decades of its existence¹⁴ - a biographical list of priors up to Stephen's canonisation in 1189¹⁵, and Clement III's bull authorising the canonisation¹⁶. It also harks back to the medieval period in its preoccupation in determining whether or not the Grandmontines really belonged to some other order - that of Benedict, Cîteaux, or the Austin canons, and Bolland quotes a string of medieval and early modern authors upon this subject¹⁷.

But it is in the footnotes to the Vita - despite a somewhat unhealthy reliance on Frémon - that Bolland's most significant remarks occur. It is true that the chronological problems presented by the Life, which will form one of the recurring themes of this study, had been touched upon by others, but this does not diminish the impact of Bolland's remarks. Not that these are very extensive. He merely

comments that the relics of St Nicholas, the object of Stephen's pilgrimage to Bari, were not removed there until 1087, twenty-seven years after Stephen's supposed journey¹⁸. The date of Stephen's journey requires some calculation. According to the Life he was settled in Muret in 1076 at the age of thirty; before that he had spent an unspecified period of time wandering in France, four years in the household of a cardinal, and twelve years with Archbishop Milo of Benevento. This would make the earliest possible date for the pilgrimage to Bari 1060 - as Bolland observes, twenty-seven years before the date of the relics' translation¹⁹. Bolland offers no explanation for this extremely curious discrepancy.

Bolland's contribution to the historiography of the Life did not, however, stop here. He was also responsible for the entry in the Acta on Stephen's mentor, St Milo of Benevento²⁰. Here he encountered one or two problems. He first had to determine the day on which this saint is commemorated: some authorities give it as November 20th, others as May 25th²¹. A third and more persuasive faction led by the seventeenth-century Beneventan archdeacon, Mario di Vipera finally prevailed, and, following di Vipera's assertion in two works on the Beneventan church that Milo died on February 23rd, Bolland finally assigned this date to him²². Bolland also indicates that both di Vipera and another Italian, Ciarlanti, believe that the year of Milo's death was 1070²³. (This would fit in fairly well with the Life's statement that Stephen arrived at Muret in 1076.) Yet, despite all this material, one important factor is missing from Bolland's entry on Milo: he is unable to provide either vita, passio, or translatio, or any other of the genus of writings normally associated with a saint to prove it²⁴.

With the advantage of hindsight, it is possible to discern in Bolland's entries on Stephen and Milo the emergence of the two most distinctive and most durable trends in the historiography of the Life. On the one hand we have the beginnings of an awareness of the chronological difficulties presented by the Life (and if I appear to be attaching too much importance to Bolland's observations, this is because I feel that their appearance in a serious, scientific work of hagiography is itself significant.) On the other hand we have the emergence of Milo as a figure who may help to illuminate Stephen's career: in his notes on Stephen, Bolland refers the reader to his entry on Milo. Already, the process of adducing material extraneous to that of the Life has begun.

B (iii) The Life and the historians: the Maurists

Perhaps even more than the Bollandists, the Maurists were engaged in an unceasing pursuit of historical truth in the service of religion. Not that any serious distinction is being made between the sincerity and industry of the two groups: but the Maurists, in particular their 'star' Mabillon, changed the study of paleography, chronology, and diplomatic beyond all recognition and some of their works, as May has recently pointed out, have only just become redundant (and that especially in the case of L'art de vérifier les dates 'because of the size of the volumes'). The writings of the Maurists on Stephen are of interest not only to the historian of Grandmont but also to anyone interested in the sciences of chronology and diplomatic as we can see their development even within this limited context.

The culmination of the Maurists' labours on the Life of Stephen of Muret was reached in 1729 when Martène and Durand published in their Veterum Scriptorum.....Amplissima Collectio the version of the Life of Stephen contained in Gerard Ithier's Speculum together with some observations on the origins of the text, notes and, in the introduction to the volume as a whole, a section dealing with the origins of Grandmont²⁵. (In the same volume also appear a Historia Brevis and a Historia Prolixior of the priors of Grandmont²⁶.) But Maurist scholarship on the Life had begun three decades previously with the appearance in 1701 of volume nine of the Acta Sanctorum Ordinis Sancti Benedicti²⁷. The introduction to this second part of the 'sixth century' contains a whole chapter devoted to the origins and Rule of Grandmont. The Acta Sanctorum OSB was begun under d'Achery but was largely the work of Mabillon who contents himself at this early stage with discussing, much in the manner of the Bollandists, and citing many of the same authorities as Bolland, whether or not Grandmont sub Sancti Benedicti principio militavit²⁸. Opinions, he points out, diverged: but he himself favoured the attribution to the Order of Benedict because of the evidence of a bull of Gregory VII. This is the bull originally mentioned by Levesque; and the text runs as follows:

Quoniam religiosam vitam instituentes apostolico oportet uti iudicio et consilio ne quidam post suum proprium sentire abeuntes, cum temeritate et inexpertis viribus aggrediantur poenitentiae iter, quod non possent perficere, ac deficient in eo, ita ut a proposito resilire coaguntur ad confusionem et injuriam ordinis ecclesiastici. Nos vero cognito, quod apud venerabilem fratrem nostrum Milonem archiepiscopum

Beneventanum, cum frequentatione filiorum et fratrum nostrorum Benedictensium de Calabria virtutis tirocinium sive habitu posueris, et sumto de solido tuo desiderii servire experimento, per quattuor annos in aula pontificali sanctissimi patris bonae memoriae Alexandri divina providentia papae huius nominis secundi, praedecessoris nostri dum coram ipso beatissimo pontifice archidiaconum cardinalem ageremus: cum tuis viribus a natura delicatis diffideremus, non tam cito manus super te imposuimus, sicut nos cum Timotheo docunt Apostolus, ad cuius tumbam consistimus. Verum cum indeficientur a Sancta Sede, in qua sedemus, licet indigni et inviti, postules potestatem auspicandi conceptum Ordinem monasticam juxta regulam Beati Benedicti, quam diu expertus es inter fratres de Calabria: nos nolentes extinguere spiritum eo propensius ac benignius inclinati, nunc tibi concedimus et annuimus, quo maiori Spiritus sancti flamma accensi desideramus agrum dominicum tam sanctis virtutum seminaris ditari. In consequentibus Stephano, eiusque coeptio bene precatur Gregorius optatque ei adduci socios innumeros beatum patrem Benedictum in spiritualibus et temporalibus suffragari. Datum Romae in praesentia carissimae filiae Agnetis augustae imperatricis et sex fratrum nostrum cardinalium, Kalendas Maii, pontificatus nostri anno primo²⁹.

It was the phrase 'Benedictines of Calabria' in this document which led Mabillon to place the Grandmontines under the banner of the Benedictine Order³⁰. However, in his next encounter with the Life of Stephen, he was not only to display a much greater awareness of the difficulties presented by the text itself, but also to cast the trained eye of a scholar now well-versed in diplomatic over the bull in a much more critical appraisal of its form and content.

. Volume five of the Annales of the Order of St Benedict was, in fact, completed after Mabillon's death by Massuet; but the credit for most of the material and scholarship which it contains must go to Mabillon himself. Among his entries for the year 1073 he refers to the bull; but far from accepting its testimony he now points out several major inconsistencies in its composition³¹. It is dated 'Kal. Maii 1073', i.e. 1st May 1073; but Gregory VII was only elected on May 11th, and it could not have been issued in the presence of the empress Agnes, as the text states, as she was in Monte Cassino and not in Rome at the time. Mabillon recalls the remarks of Bernard Gui who, writing in the thirteenth century, refers to a 'licence' granted by the pope to Stephen in terms of a document rather than the verbal assent suggested by the Life; but he is forced, in the end, to reject the bull as a forgery. Not only is its date suspect, but the formula 'servus servorum Dei' was

not used by Gregory until a year after his consecration: before this he described himself as in Romanum pontificem electus. Mabillon reveals the known provenance of the supposed bull: it was first brought to the attention of the 'annalist' of Grandmont, Levesque, by one François Escouvet who claimed to have found it in the archives of St Bénigne in Dijon. Perhaps this is the appropriate point at which to add that there is no record of its appearance before this discovery by Escouvet³².

But it is the problems posed by the chronology of the Life which create major problems for Mabillon. Stephen, he reminds us, is said by the author of the Life to have spent twelve years with archbishop Milo of Benevento and four in the household of a cardinal before obtaining papal permission to found an order of his own; but Milo is said by Bolland to have died in 1070 (see above for Bolland's sources) and by Ughelli, the author of the Italia Sacra, to have died in 1075³³. And, as Mabillon points out, Milo's predecessor Udalric ('Vodalric') was still alive in 1059 (he attended a council of the church at Rome during this year) and Milo could not therefore have become archbishop until around 1060 at the earliest. From this, Mabillon reasons, Gerard Ithier's statements about the length of Stephen's stays with both Milo and the cardinal and the point at which Milo died are incorrect. Not only was Milo alive in 1075, as an act published by Ughelli indicates, but he survived until 1078.

Mabillon quotes from an 'old document' concerning the foundation of a cell of the monastery of St Florent-de-Saumur at Dol in Brittany which was built in 1078 per auctoritatem p. Gregorii VII et per testimonium Milonis archiepiscopo qui prius Decanus Parisiacensia (sic) ecclesiae ab apostolico ordinatus est Archiepiscopus Beneventanae....³⁴. Gerard's chronology, Mabillon concludes, must be wrong; and he advances the theory that his errors may have arisen from a possible preliminary visit by Milo to Benevento in unknown circumstances - but possibly in some ecclesiastical capacity - at an earlier date. His protege Stephen may therefore have first met him elsewhere and then accompanied him to Italy on his promotion. But if this is a possible solution to the vexed question of chronology, other important questions remain unanswered. Mabillon discusses the problem of the identity of the hermits of Calabria who inspired both Milo and Stephen, but although he suggests the hermits of Magella or the Uticensis monk Robert as possible candidates for the honour of being referred to in the Life, he is unable to

reach any definite conclusion on this point. He devotes much of his remaining remarks to a survey of opinion on the question of the identity and spiritual alignment of the Rule of Grandmont³⁵.

Mabillon's Annales Ordinis Sancti Benedicti is a year by year survey of the events of what we may call - borrowing a phrase from one of his other works - the Benedictine centuries³⁶. It does not include the Lives of saints in their entire or even their original form, reproducing only extracts where necessary; and so a full text of the Speculum Life of Stephen of Muret is given for the first time in a Maurist production in the Veterum Scriptorum.....Amplissima Collectio of Martène and Durand³⁷. For this edition Martène used three manuscripts two from the seminary at Limoges and one from the monastery of St Martin at Tours³⁸: in these the Life is accompanied by 'S Stephani dicta et facta', 'versus de virtutibus eiusdem', and an account of the gift of an arm of the saint to the canons of Thiers in 1427. Martène claims to be able to discern, on stylistic grounds, that the Life (including Miracula) is the work of one author and that its conclusion is the work of another. As the thirteenth-century chronicler Bernard Gui had stated that the fourth prior, Stephen Liciac (1133-63) had composed the 'dicta et facta' of Stephen, Martène identified the conclusion with this work³⁹.

In their introduction on some of the 'new' orders of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, Martène and Durand are inevitably drawn to the question of the chronology outlined in the Life which will prove, they confess, 'nodum Gordium.....vel labyrinthum'⁴⁰. According to Gerard Ithier's chronology, Stephen must have gone on pilgrimage to Bari when he was aged about twelve - yet the relics of St Nicholas only arrived in Bari 'several years later'⁴¹. Like Mabillon in the Annales, they too adduce new evidence for the career of Milo of Benevento, in this case a Beneventan chronicle 'apud nos MSS' which records Milo's succession to the archbishopric in 1074: Milo consecratus est in archiepiscopum Beneventi.....⁴² To this they add the testimony of the document in Ughelli's Italia Sacra previously mentioned by Mabillon which states that 1075 was the first year of Milo's archiepiscopate, and also that of the same Beneventan chronicle which records the accession of a new archbishop, Roffredus, in 1077⁴³.

How, then, are we to account for the four years which Stephen is said to have spent in the household of a cardinal after the death

of Milo and before his retreat to Muret, which took place, according to the Life in 1076? Martène and Durand suggest that the Grandmontine order cannot have been founded before 1081, and also that the Calabrian hermits of the Life may have been the Carthusians, who founded houses in Calabria from 1090 on, following pope Urban II's invitation to Bruno to move to southern Italy⁴⁴. The infamous 'bull' of Gregory VII appears here for the last time: not only do Martène and Durand repeat many of Mabillon's observations on its diplomatic, but they also venture into the science of sigillography. The seal which Levesque describes as being attached to the 'bull' is of a type unknown among papal seals: it shows a lion with its right forepaw pointing towards a star, and the motto 'signat ad astram viam'⁴⁵.

But if the supposed bull has been finally and definitely disposed of, a quick glance at the notes which Martène and Durand append to the text itself serves to illustrate the degree of difficulty created not so much by the peculiar chronology of the Life itself as by the growing dossier on Milo. Martène and Durand discuss the implications of the discovery by Mabillon of the document connecting Milo with the foundation of the cell of St Florentius at Dol. They offer the attractive hypothesis that Stephen may have met Milo in France and then spent several years with him there before accompanying him to Benevento, and they place the foundation of the order of Grandmont (Stephen's retreat to Muret in the eyes of commentators of this period) around 1080. They are compelled to deal somewhat unsatisfactorily with the date of the foundation at Dol (1073 according to Mabillon) by saying that the use of Milo's name in the document can only be a reference to the events of several years earlier: his intervention must have taken place several years before the cell was actually built⁴⁶.

B (iv) The Life and the historians: Becquet and his predecessors

The nineteenth century proved to be a somewhat barren period for the historiography of the Life: historians such as Guibert and Lecler - whose work has a strong flavour of the antiquarian - have tended to skip over the basic problems presented by the Life in their compilations on Grandmontine history⁴⁷. Not until the appearance, in 1955, of Becquet's article on 'Saint Stephen of Muret and Archbishop

Milo of Benevento' was anyone to undertake a detailed treatment of the historical problems of the Life - problems which had, if anything, been rendered more acute by earlier attempts to deal with them. The greatest difficulty posed by the Life itself is, of course, its account of Stephen's pilgrimage to Bari at a period before the arrival of the relics which he was supposedly visiting; but the work of the Bollandists and Maurists has also helped to reveal some of its other deficiencies. The identity of the 'hermits of Calabria' - whose antecedents and location are ill-defined in the Life - has puzzled many commentators; and we are not given the name of the cardinal in whose household Stephen spent four years nor even that of the pope who granted Stephen permission to found his order - in this latter case it has always been taken for granted that it must have been Gregory VII.

The scepticism expressed about the Life in the Histoire de l'Eglise is hardly surprising or unreasonable⁴⁸; and it must be said that, viewed in a dispassionate light, the efforts of the Maurists and Bollandists have done more to increase than dispel doubt. Their evolution of a separate biography for Milo of Benevento has only confused the issue further, as, according to their sources, he reigned for only two years at the most instead of twelve, and died only one year - and not four - before the date given for Stephen's move to Muret. Moreover, the document from Dol which Mabillon quotes has introduced more than a shade of doubt into the question of the date of Milo's death as given by the Beneventan chronicle: was he still alive in 1073 or not? Despite the complexity of all these questions Becquet nevertheless felt that by 1955 he had largely vindicated the authenticity of the Life on textual grounds by his discovery of two manuscripts which ante-dated the Speculum Grandimontis and which, he maintained, provided us with a more respectable text.

Although Becquet had already published, in 1952, one article on the order of Grandmont, his first definitive contribution to the historiography of the Life appeared in the Revue Mabillon of 1953.

'The earliest writers of the order of Grandmont' is a complex piece of work which deals not only with the origins of the Life itself but also with those of several other early texts. For our purposes, however, its chief significance is its treatment of the Vita Stephanis.

Martène, it may be remembered, had claimed to be able to discern, on stylistic grounds, that the Life and miracles on the one hand and its conclusion on the other had been composed by two different authors. As Bernard Gui had stated that the fourth prior of Grandmont, Stephen of Liciac (1139-63) composed the 'dicta et facta' of Stephen, Martène identified the conclusion, 'Hic comprehendunt.....etc', with this work⁴⁹. After Martène's death, Hauréau examined his notes and was able to trace a 'Sermo vel Tractatus' by Gerard Ithier. In this treatise Gerard attributed three works - a Life, a book of reflections, and a rule - to a disciple of Stephen, Hugh of Lacerta, and Hauréau identifies them with the 'dicta et facta' already attributed to Hugh by Martène, with a rule already known at this time, and with a book of reflections which Hauréau regarded as having been lost⁵⁰.

The link between the reference to an earlier Life and the 'dicta et facta' - the conclusion of Martène's version of the Life - might well have been maintained to this day were it not for Becquet's discovery of two manuscript versions of the Life which obviously ante-date that of the Speculum⁵¹. These are MS Trinity College 1222 (O.3.50) ff 90-95, and MS Paris BN lat. no. 10.891 ff 1-28. These are respectively dated by Becquet to the early thirteenth century and the twelfth century⁵²: and although he does not make this entirely plain at this point, it is clear that Becquet considers that the Cambridge manuscript, probably written in or just after the year 1221, derives from an older exemplar than the Paris version which was set down at an earlier date⁵³.

Both manuscripts present only the second of the three prologues given in the Speculum, although here they omit the qualificative sanctus used in the Speculum Life which postulates Stephen's canonisation in 1189⁵⁴. Certain passages from the Speculum Life do not appear in either of the manuscripts. These are:

- (a) An indication that Stephen's father was viscount of Thiers;
- (b) an obvious topos - the comparison of the young Stephen with Jesus in the Temple;
- (c) an account of the saint's initial homecoming (i.e. a preliminary return before the final one of 1076); 'a strange episode', as Becquet says, 'which has no other effect than to make Stephen absent from home when his protector, Archbishop Milo, dies';
- (d) an episode in which the saint feels a deep emotion on

leaving his friends and family forever - a manifestation of divine grace;

- (e) an explicit comparison of his ideals with those of monks, canons, and hermits;
- (f) and two jarringly rhetorical sections ending with a doxology.

The Cambridge Life ends with a doxological formula and is accompanied by a recital of the miracles which took place under the second prior, Peter of Limoges (1124-37). The Paris manuscript adds an account of a miracle which took place after his death, and those in which the fourth prior, Stephen of Liciac (1139-63) is referred to in the past tense. The conclusion of the Paris manuscript begins with the phrase: 'Here is a brief account of the virtues and sanctity of our master, saint Stephen, by brother Odo', and is followed by the first chapter of the so-called 'dicta et facta'. This is a eulogy of the founder, although it does not call Stephen a saint and 'the first founder of the order of Grandmont' as does the Speculum. The same hand has also written the Versus Odonis de Virtutibus which follow - these are included in the Speculum without the indication that they were composed by Odo and without the final 'Glory and praise to Christ'. Finally, the copyist adds to the Paris manuscript a very short account of a miracle which took place during Stephen's own lifetime. It does not form part of the Cambridge Life, but can be found as chapter 51 of that in the Speculum⁵⁵.

'All these facts' writes Becquet, 'seem sufficient to establish the existence of a Vita A which antedates the priorate of Gerard Ithier'. He then proceeds to establish authorship of this earlier Life. Although Gerard Ithier attributed a Vita to Hugh of Lacerta, Stephen's disciple, in his Sermo vel Tractatus he describes him elsewhere 'illiteratus' and implies that he entrusted his memories to a more learned brother. A Life of Hugh himself was composed between 1163 and 1170 by the Grandmontine William of St-Savin who admits that he had never met his hero and whose work is of an edificatory rather than a historical nature; but he attributes to Hugh quidquid de sententiis vel de caeteris vitae nostrae mandatio invenitur fideliter scriptum aut memoriám hominúm comméndatur⁵⁶. We are not necessarily dealing here with a Life as such; and the whole situation is further confused by the fact that Hugh appears to have ended his days in a cell some distance from Grandmont⁵⁷. However, Becquet believes that it is just

possible for Hugh to have confided in his more literate brothers. He also indicates the possibility that the fourth prior of Grandmont, Stephen of Liciac, was responsible for the setting-down of the Life: a twelfth-century notice on him says, among other things, that he ordered the deeds of Stephen - which had almost fallen into oblivion - to be set down and then read out.

Becquet concluded, after an investigation of the Rule and the Liber Sententiarum, both of which antedate the Life, that these works were inspired by the recollections of Hugh (and possibly those of other disciples, too) and that Stephen of Liciac took the initiative to have them set down. After the crisis which overtook the Grandmontine order in 1185-8, the seventh prior, Gerard Ithier, who had eventually succeeded, with papal aid, in establishing the peace, compiled the Speculum the purpose of which was evidently eirenic and unificatory. To the Life which Stephen of Liciac had produced, Gerard added some other accounts of miracles, and some new explanatory and edificatory material (perhaps not always with the desired results, as the list of the discrepancies between the Vita A and the Speculum Life indicates); and he also included in his compilation the Rule, the Liber Sententiarum, and some works of his own on the doctrine of the order⁵⁸.

The implication of this and some further research on the Life are spelled out by Becquet in his article of 1955 'Saint Stephen of Muret and Archbishop Milo of Benevento'⁵⁹. He concedes that the Life 'does not enjoy much credit with present-day historians' and goes on to catalogue the names of some of those who have noted its deficiencies. The remarks of de Ghellinck, Rousset de Pina, and Fliche have already been mentioned and there is no need to repeat them here⁶⁰: but Becquet is now able to assert that their strictures apply to the Life reproduced by Martene rather than to the newly-discovered Vita A of the Cambridge and Paris manuscripts. This latter version has emerged shorn of unnecessary repetition, edifying topoi, and several posthumous miracles and it is certainly possible to agree with Becquet at this stage that it is a more respectable-looking work of hagiography⁶¹. Nevertheless Becquet is still compelled to express one or two reservations over the Vita A. His own researches on the Speculum and the two manuscripts from which he derives his new text have led him to accept that the Vita A emerged from the same milieu as a pseudo-epigraphic Rule and that Hugh of Lacerta's involvement with early Grandmontine writings is problematical as he is supposed to have died not at Grandmont itself, but at a cell some distance away⁶². Becquet is also

aware that the text of Vita A is still full of 'errors and imprecisions'⁶³. His article on Stephen and Milo represents the result of his investigations into the many contradictions and obscurities of the Life - an attempt to 'draw from the Life whatever it can give'⁶⁴.

Becquet begins his study of the Life, not unnaturally, with 'the events closest to its compiler', the visit of the two cardinals and legates, Gregory and Pierleone, respectively the future pope and anti-pope, Innocent II and Anacletus II, to Stephen's retreat at Muret shortly before his death⁶⁵. Stephen was closely questioned by these two about his spiritual and religious background; and by way of reply he recounted to them the story of his youth and his upbringing by Archbishop Milo of Benevento, 'who had', in the words of Becquet 'inspired in him a profound admiration for the Calabrian hermits of his diocese'⁶⁶. The anonymous author of the Life is, as Becquet quickly indicates, 'ill at ease'⁶⁷ with the chronology of his hero's youth. The only date given in the Life is that of Stephen's entry into the 'desert' of Muret in his thirtieth year in 1076 and the assertion that Stephen had been taken to southern Italy by his father on a pilgrimage to the relics of St Nicholas at Bari is not - as our earlier commentators have said - in accordance with the known date of the translation of the relics to Italy in 1087. Above all, Becquet points out, the author of the Life is ignorant of the dates and length of Milo's archiepiscopate as he makes Stephen spend a total of twelve years with the archbishop who only ruled for two years. And, in addition to this, Stephen is supposed to have spent another four years in the household of a cardinal before his retreat to Muret⁶⁸.

Becquet nevertheless considers that 'despite these errors and obscurities the personality of Milo throws valuable light on the whole story'⁶⁹. Here Becquet owes much to the Italian historian Ughelli, compiler of Italia sacra who reproduces a synodal document 'dated to 1074 or 1075' and signed by Milo⁷⁰; and he also refers us to the Monumenta Germaniae Historica edition of an 'eleventh-century Italian chronicle'⁷¹ which records that Milo was consecrated in 1074 and died in 1075. His successor, according to Becquet, is mentioned from 1076 onwards. Becquet also notes Ughelli's identification of the date of Milo's death as February 23rd 'according to the Beneventan necrology'⁷². The same date is retained by the editors of the Acta Sanctorum Boll.

February III 411-412 with the same indications of Beneventan origin⁷³. Benevento was, as Becquet correctly indicates, of great importance to the papacy at this period: it had been given into papal rule during the pontificate of Leo IX (1048-54), and in 1073 Gregory VII had concluded a treaty with Landulf, the last of the Lombard princes, which confirmed papal authority over the city. It was also at Benevento that Gregory arranged to meet Robert Guiscard in 1074.

In these circumstances, Becquet argues, it was quite possible for Gregory to have put an end to what had been an episcopal vacancy in Benevento by placing his own man on the throne. The last known reference to a predecessor of Milo goes back, according to Becquet, to 1071; he was not, however, among the number of lay and ecclesiastical dignitaries present at the dedication of the new basilica at Monte Cassino in October of that year, nor does he figure among the signatories of the 1073 agreement with Landulf. In this context Becquet also notes the promotion of the prior of Cluny and other monks to bishoprics such as that of Ostia by Gregory VII⁷⁴.

Working from several French sources, Becquet is also able to re-construct Milo's career before he became archbishop of Benevento. He cites a document - already given in part by the Maurists - which describes Milo as a dean of Paris who acted as Gregory VII's intermediary in the business of the construction of a new cell of St Florent-de-Saumur at Dol in Brittany⁷⁵. He has also found in Gallia Christiana an entry in a 'necrology of Paris' giving the day of death of a dean named Milo as February 22 - a day before the date on which Archbishop Milo of Benevento is supposed to have died⁷⁶. Becquet sees this as positive confirmation of the link between the two Milos rather than as evidence which may militate against identifying the two as the same man, and he believes that the difference of a day between the Paris and Beneventan necrologies is the result of a copyist's error. (There is a similar discrepancy between the Paris and Chartres necrologies over the date of death of the bishop of Paris at this time).

There is other evidence for Milo's French career, brought to light for the first time by Becquet: a Milo was dean of the church of St Denis de la Châtre, which lay outside Paris at this period, in 1067, and a dean named Milo was a signatory to an act of Philip I of November 1071. The position of the signatory indicates that this Milo must have been dean of Paris itself⁷⁷. Becquet has found nothing to contradict

his reconstruction of Milo's career: the latest known reference to the previous dean of Paris, Odo, dates from before May 1070, and there is no other reference to any other dean of Paris apart from Milo - according to Becquet - until 1080⁷⁸.

'How' asks Becquet, 'was Gregory VII's attention drawn to the dean Milo'⁷⁹? He initially offers the hypotheses that Gregory - then Hildebrand - might have met Milo during his French legation of 1056 or that the dean might have been drawn to his attention by Gerard of Ostia or by Raimbaud after the councils of Clermont, Chalon and Paris of 1073-4⁸⁰. But he rejects these in favour of what he considers to be more positive evidence. This turns out to be one of the verse-letters of the eleventh-century poet Fulcoie of Beauvais in which a dean of Paris named Milo is accused of zelotipia - jealousy. Fulcoie, himself a churchman and to become archdeacon of Meaux describes Milo in extremely unflattering terms, similar to those in which, in another of his poems, he castigates Milo's predecessor Odo. Becquet - who does not reproduce either poem, referring the reader to the editions by Colker - regards these works as satirical fantasies of the poet's youth, aberrations which he must have regretted at a later date. In some of the other poems of the series, Becquet says, Fulcoie 'flatters and defends archbishop Manasses of Rheims, a shameless simoniac who had to be deposed by Gregory VII: he also defends clerical marriage on the grounds that it prevents even worse abuses'⁸¹.

Fulcoie's relationship with Manasses and his defence of clerical marriage are both, in Becquet's view, crucial to an understanding of the poem addressed to Milo: in other words we should equate Fulcoie's disapproval with a morally praiseworthy outlook on Milo's part. Despite the considerable obscurity of the poem, he is nevertheless able to draw from it evidence of Milo's opposition to clerical marriage. Becquet emphasises the fact the years 1070-80 saw the height of Gregory VII's struggle against simony and nicolaism. The pope issued his first reforming decrees in 1074-5; and although Becquet fails to state his case explicitly at all times, it is clear that he wishes to link Milo with Gregory with what has become known as the reform movement - hence his promotion in 1074 to the archbishopric of Benevento⁸².

Before drawing this brief but extremely important article to a close, Becquet makes one unsuccessful attempt to determine the identity of the hermits of Calabria who exerted such a significant influence on

Stephen and Milo⁸³; unable, like many before him, to reach any definite conclusion as to their identity, he ends by giving his conclusions on the reliability of the Vita A now that it has been subjected to his historical scrutiny. We can, he believes, have much more confidence in it than in the Speculum Life which was the only version known before he made his discovery of the two manuscripts of the earlier Life. The Vita A, he argues, is a work of a less obviously edifying nature than Gerard Ithier's text: only three miracles are attributed to the saint in his lifetime, and two of these are conversions brought about by his prayers. Certainly there is less spectacular sanctity here; and Becquet believes that any suspicions which may arise from the circumstance that the Rule of Grandmont antedates the Life of Stephen should be allayed by the inclusion, in the latter, of Stephen's vow on renouncing the world and of an account of his personal ascetic practises, neither of which are dealt with in the Rule.

The author of the Life, we are told, wished to add to the teaching and basic precepts of the Life an edifying biography, the contours of which, although somewhat imprecise in view of the lapse of time between Stephen's death and its composition, could not obviously contradict either the Rule or the Book of Maxims, compiled thanks to the faithful Hugh of Lacerta⁸⁴. Several problems, Becquet concedes, still remain: that of papal approval of Stephen, from whence issued a false bull of Gregory VII; of Stephen's profession of faith, which Becquet describes as recalling the entry into serfdom; of the episode in which Stephen's disciples threaten to throw their master's miracle-working body into the river, which closely resembles an incident in the Life of St Bernard. Becquet finally states that it is in the Liber de Doctrina that we still find the true spirituality of Stephen, for which Milo provided the inspiration⁸⁵.

The final apotheosis of Becquet's textual and historical rehabilitation of the Life of Stephen took place in 1968 with the publication of the Scriptores Ordinis Grandimontensis, a substantial volume which includes not only the Liber de Doctrina, the Rule, and the Vita A (together with the additions of the Speculum Life) but also twenty-one other early Grandmontine works, or parts of works. Becquet includes very little in the way of textual or historical commentary in this volume, giving only very brief notices as to which manuscripts or

editions he has consulted. In place of any more substantial help, he refers the reader to a selection of his own essays which appear in periodicals such as the Révue Mabillon or the Bulletin de la Société Historique et Archéologique du Limousin⁸⁶. From this selection he unaccountably omits his 'Saint Stephen of Muret and Archbishop Milo of Benevento'. However, his opinions about the Life, insofar as they can be ascertained from his brief remarks on the subject, had not undergone any radical change between the 1950s and 1968, although he now appears to lay slightly greater stress on the fact that the Trinity College manuscript although in a later hand (and the approximate date of its writing can be ascertained from the evidence of another piece in the codex) actually derives from an earlier source⁸⁷. As it does not contain any of the chapter headings of the Paris manuscript, Becquet's inclusion of them in his main text of the Vita A seems quite inexplicable.

C The problem of Milo of Benevento

Despite the shortcomings of which Becquet himself is at least in part aware, it is easy to see why his justification of the Life of Stephen has ultimately succeeded in silencing the doubts felt by historians on the subject of the origins of Grandmont. In discovering the Vita A, he is able to point to a text which gives the appearance of being something nearer the unvarnished truth - even if the essential differences between it and the later Life are, in reality, slight. But in his historical investigation Becquet has pulled off a master-stroke: although he approaches Milo of Benevento in essentially the same way (and for the same basic reasons) as the Bollandists and Maurists, he has succeeded in investing the hitherto shadowy figure of Milo with a distinct personality, thus making the link between the Limousin and southern Italy appear - despite our continuing ignorance on the subject of the hermits of Calabria - much less tenuous than formerly supposed. But is this personality as securely established as Becquet believes?

C (i) Milo as Saint

Milo of Benevento's appearances in modern works of reference on saints are necessarily limited: some of the more influential works

were compiled either before or just after the publication of Becquet's articles dealing with him, and even those of a slightly later date can hardly be expected to include him as a matter of course. Despite his importance to this investigation Milo hardly ranks as one of the major saints of the catholic church. He does, however, feature in the Book of Saints with the briefest of biographical notices: and here it is recorded that he is commemorated on February 23rd, and that he enjoys a 'popular cult' i.e. there is no official record of his canonisation. (This leads the editors of the Book of Saints to describe him as 'Blessed', rather than giving him the title of saint)⁸⁸. So far, there is nothing really unusual in this: even in a period when increasing recourse was being made to the formal processes of canonisation, many holy men and women enjoyed a strictly unofficial commemoration which was nonetheless faithfully observed. In any case Benevento felt none of the pressing need to establish the cult of a patron saint exhibited by, for example, thirteenth-century York⁸⁹: it possessed the relics of the apostle Bartholomew along with those of St Mercurius and of several martyrs discovered in 1119 and those of several other lesser-known saints⁹⁰. The brief entry for Milo contains nothing exceptional and we appear to be dealing with a well-established local cult. The references to Milo in the Life of Stephen do nothing to contradict this picture. He is only described once as sanctus - which, in any case, could be rendered as 'holy'; otherwise he is sanctissimus, 'very holy'; venerabilis, or venerable; and beatissimus, 'most blessed'⁹¹. And even if he was never formally canonised, Milo possesses the attributes which the eminent Bollandist Delehaye considers vital to the establishment of the authentication of a saint or beatus, the 'hagiographical co-ordinates' of the date and place of his translation⁹². So far, Becquet's faith in the illuminating personality of Milo would seem to be well-founded.

If we take our investigation of Milo's sainthood or cult further back the picture becomes rather less clear. The hotchpotch of late medieval sources quoted by the Bollandists in their note on Milo all refer to him as 'saint'; but some refer to him as Molo or even Nolo and three alternative dates are given for the day of his death. Bolland eventually accepted February 23rd, rather than May 25th or November 20th⁹³, as the former date is supported by the Beneventan di Vipera, whose catalogue of Beneventan saints was published in

1635⁹⁴. Not only does a study of Bolland and his sources reveal that Milo's name and hagiographical co-ordinates are rather less firmly established than we might suppose, but his failure to find either vita or translatio for Milo stands out in a work the main content of which is either vitae or accounts of translations. While lack of a Life is not entirely unprecedented, it is certainly rare.

The faint suspicions engendered by the Bollandists' compilation on Milo are to some extent allayed by the names of the sources which they quote - the comparative unreliability (in these circumstances) of medieval or Renaissance sources such as Raphael Maffei, Volterranus, is counteracted by those of the Beneventan church historians Ciarlanti and di Vipera. It is to these two latter sources - and ultimately the work of di Vipera - that Bolland derives his classification of Milo as a saint. Milo's inclusion in di Vipera's catalogue of saints of the Beneventan church would appear to dispel any doubts about the genuineness of his claim to sanctity: despite the comparatively late date (1635) one would expect to find here evidence of an authentic cult presumably dating back to the medieval period. But here is the introduction to part two of the work, in which Milo is featured:

Here follows the history of other holy men of Beneventan birth and blood who, in many ways, but most of all on account of the sanctity of their lives, bring distinction to their native Benevento. But because their acts have altogether perished - on account of the number of times our city has been ruined - there is no holy-day kept in our Beneventan cathedral in their memory.....⁹⁵

In other words, di Vipera is admitting - although he is prepared to advance a reason to excuse this - that none of these natives of Benevento (this certainly gives the story of Milo an additional twist!) are known or celebrated as saints. Today, the situation is the same: despite the testimony of di Vipera, the visitor to Benevento who searches for evidence of a cult of St Milo will search in vain. There is no altar or tomb of St Milo, no church dedicated to him, and no record of any church formerly bearing his name. He does not figure in religious art in the area of Benevento, and the director of the provincial archive, himself a historian of medieval Benevento, has never seen the name of St Milo invoked in any document of the period, nor on any medieval seal⁹⁶. Di Vipera was, it appears, attempting to create a new clutch of Beneventan saints - an action which appears quite understandable in the light of the ecclesiastical rivalry between Benevento, Naples, and Salerno in the seventeenth century highlighted by Lanzoni in Le diocesi d'Italia⁹⁷. It was an attempt

which failed singularly - in the long term at least - on the home ground of Benevento itself: but the archdeacon, if he were alive today, might well feel proud of the remarkable success which one part of his efforts has enjoyed with authorities as distinguished as the Bollandists, the Maurists, and Dom Becquet.

The exposure of the myth of the sainthood and cult of archbishop Milo of Benevento removes one of the most basic assumptions common to the body of historical research which has grown up around - and provided a supplement to - the Life of Stephen of Muret. So general and unquestioning has been the acceptance of Milo's sainthood by historians of Grandmont, that the disappearance of this vital element from the hitherto accepted picture of the career of Stephen of Muret inevitably serves to bring into question the validity of the other components in the picture of Milo and its reliability as a whole. The accepted version of the 'Life' of Milo as reconstructed by Becquet and others is extremely plausible: it is quite likely, for instance, that an Auvergnat such as Milo would have commenced his career in the French church before being promoted to a diocese in southern Italy, an unusual, although not unheard-of move. It is also quite possible that Gregory VII was anxious to fill the archbishopric at Benevento with a reliable candidate, thereby strengthening his position in southern Italy, where the papacy's new and dangerous allies the Normans were continually increasing their power. But a plausible theory does not constitute definite proof: and it now remains to be seen whether or not the accepted 'facts' concerning Milo will withstand the test of detailed scrutiny.

C (ii) Milo Dean of Paris

Becquet's curriculum vitae for Milo begins straightforwardly enough when the latter appears as dean of the church of St Denis-de-la-Châtre, outside Paris, in a document of 1067. Milo then apparently becomes chancellor of the Parisian church by 1070 and its dean by 1071. As we possess the original of only one of the documents from which Becquet draws all this information - that of 1070 which concludes with the words Ego Milo cancellarius relegi et^{Sub}scripsi⁹⁸ - it is impossible to say definitely whether or not all three documents deal with the same

man: but the balance of probability and the conventional career-structure there indicated would seem to favour Becquet's conclusion that they do.

Becquet is on less secure ground in his affirmation that we know of no other dean of Paris before one named John, who appears in a document of 1080. The year is, in fact, 1079⁹⁹; but even this slightly earlier date accords ill with the assumption that Milo left Paris to become archbishop of Benevento in or around 1074. Why is no other dean of Paris mentioned in this five-year interval? Prou's Receuil des actes de Philippe Ier and the Gallia Christiana indicate that we are not simply dealing with a lacuna in the documentation of the Parisian church¹⁰⁰. Could there perhaps have been a vacancy in the decanate between 1074 and 1079? Possibly; but a re-examination of the remainder of Becquet's material dealing with Milo's career in France suggests another, and radically different, solution to the problem.

The first of the two pieces of evidence on which Becquet rests his case for Milo is a document describing the foundation of the priory of St Florentius at Dol in Brittany: Milo is referred to as a dean of Paris who became archbishop of Benevento and who interceded with Pope Gregory VII in the matter of the foundation. This document can immediately be recognised as the one from which Mabillon quotes - without giving any details about its origins - in the Annales Ordinis Sancti Benedicti¹⁰¹. As Becquet indicates, it was first published by the Breton Lobineau in the second volume of his Histoire de Bretagne (1707); and it is also printed in Morice's Mémoires pour servir de Preuves a l'histoire de Bretagne (I) of 1742. As it plays such an important part in any study of Milo, the full text is given here:

Scripture huius veraci assertione notum fieri volumus has donationes quas abbas Guillelmus ad monachatum veniens contulit loco Sancti Florentii. In primis Ecclesiam Planae Filgeriae & decimam omnem & censum domorum cimiterii & etc. Postea donaverunt Joannes et Gilduinus eius fratres medietatem ecclesiae de Lanrigen & medietatem decimae. Alteram medietatem comparavit abbas Guillelmus IV libras denariorum a Rivallone filio Constantii Presb. annuentibus Johanne & Gilduino, ipsoque Rivallone promittente se defensurum contra omnes homines. Deinde dederunt praedicti fratres abbatis monachis Sancti Florentii, quocumque loco, sive in Ratello, sive in Comburno starent, in omnibus forestis suis de Comburno pastum precoribus eorum & pasnaticum porcorum suorum propriorum & meditatorium

suorum & de eisdem forestis ligna & ad socum & ad quisquid voluerint faciendum. Post modum dederunt medietatem census sepiam in fluvio Rentra ad sanctum Ciliacum, excepta redecima quae est monachorum Sancti Martini. Et Olivarius de Dinano dedit alteram medietatem concedente filio eius Goffrido & eius conjuge Cana & hi testes Goffredus Siniscallus, Manigundus frater eius, Radulfus filius Doalloni, Evanus filius Haimonis.

Deinceps dederunt villam Mezvoit prope castellum Dolis cum omnibus consuetudinibus quas in ea habebant & ex altera parte villae vineas proprias. Subinde dedit Johannes pro sua & pro fratris sui Gelduini anima, villam Betivon in parrochia de Roz cum omnibus quae in ea habebat & terram Hameti militis. Harum dationum testes sunt ipse abbas Vellelmus cui factae sunt, & ex monachis Hamo, Eventius & etc. Et ex laicis Hingandus, Badero, Eudo filius Goffredi, Vellelmus Gobbio, Trihannus filius Brientii, Hugo Taon, Hamo filius Roaldi, Alanus Siniscallus, Morvannus, Hogo de Mara, Bernardo de Sancto Dominico, Glarus propositus, Galterius & Herveius filii eius, Buterius & etc.

In supradicta villa scilicet Mezvoit coepit Johannes construere monasterium in honore Sanctae Mariae Sanctique Florentii per auctoritatem P. Gregorii VII et per testimonium Milonis Archiepiscopi qui prius decanus Parisiensis ecclesiae ab apostolico ordinatus est Archiepiscopus Beneventanae quem de hac re intercessorem apud Papa habuit Johannes. Eventius etiam Archiepiscopus Dolensis ut construeretur annuit & cymeterium ipse benedixit & omnes suas consuetudines illi monasterio donavit, & ut etiam feria in festivitate Sancti Florentii ibi adnuntaretur permisit ita tamen ut monachi burgenses eius in burgem suum hospitandos non receperent nisi eius gratante absolute. Canonici quoque sancti Samsonis concesserunt ea conditione neminem, sive ex burgensibus castri, sive ex optimatibus de Ratel defunctum monachi sepelirent, nisi ipsi gratanter permitterent. Horum concessor et testis ipse Comes Redon. Gauffredus. Hii etiam testes concessionis Archiepiscopi & Comitis, Andreas de Vitriaco, Gamantonus de Vitri, Willelmus Hismalensis. Goffredus de Monasterius. Goscelinus Gemaion. Odo filius Glarii. Hamo filius Roaldi. Alanus Siniscallus. Herveius Butellerius. Trihannus & Namannus filii Glari. Hamo filius Eveni. Goffredus filius Ansquetili. Goffredus filius Goscelini & plures alii. Hoc ipsum etiam Comes Goffredus filius Comitis Eidonis, cum venisset ad colloquium cum Goffredo Redon. Comite in regionem quae Ploasna dicitur, petente Johanne concessit. Testa Alano Comite eius fratre & Manigundo filio Hervei Forestarii. Herveo Butelario. Gozberto Canonico S Laudi. Nec non Hamo vice-Comes omnes consuetudines suas quas in eadem villa habebat, remisit. Teste episcopo Rainaldo, Goffrido filio Comitis Eudonis. Baderono. Radulfo de Filgeriis. Radulfo eius siniscallo. Stephano filio Ivonis. Hugone de la Mara. Alano siniscalli. Herveio butellario. Hunganno Gozbert. Trihanno. Morianno filio Graic. Alanus similiter Siniscallus dedit firmatiam eiusdem villae, id est Mezvoit, venditionem pars suam partem. Et hoc concessit Fledaldus frater eius monachi ob hoc

fratrem eius Rivallonem ad monachatum recepeunt.
 Testes Roscellinus. Corbinus. Guillelmus Bastardus.
 Guillelmus filius Letal. Huius villae jam supradictae
 i.e. Mezvoit incolae, si quis prius erant, ad panodicam
 sanctae Mariae de Carsenton pertinebant & ~~dei~~ decimas &
 primitias suas & ceteras oblationes referebant, quae
 omnia Goscelini cognomento Gemaion erat. Hic ob salvationem
 animae suae omnes redhibitiones praedictae villae decimas
 sepulturam, oblationes, monachis condonavit & de habere
 locum LX solidos accepit & Presbytero Ecclesiae de Garsenton
 concambium suum reddidit de decima villae Heraldii. Ne tamen
 mater Ecclesia omnio jus suum amitteret, fuit conventio ut
 monachi annis singulis in Assumptione Beatae Mariae XVIII
 den. pro recognitione Ecclesiae de Carsenton redderent.
 Actum hoc coram Archiepiscopo Eventio, qui ut ita fieret
 concordavit & comite Goffrido qui huius conventionis fide
 iussor est, annuente supradicta Goscelini uxore Adila &
 omnibus eius filiis Herveo, Rivallo. Ansigiso. Putiello.
 Testibus his Eudone filius Goffredi. Mainfrinitio Siniscallo.
 Tescelino. Normanno. Cartul. Abb. S. Florentii¹⁰²

If we wish to check the validity of the information contained
 in the central passage of the document, we possess a considerable body
 of independent testimony regarding the foundation of the priory at Dol.
 A document recorded in the earliest cartulary of St Florent de Saumur
 (the 'Black' Book) records the donation by John, son of Rivallon of
 Combour and half-brother of William, abbot of St Florent-sous-Dol of
 the church of Plana Filgeria, in contrast to our piece which names
 William himself as the donor¹⁰³. A short series of individual charters
 in the second-oldest cartulary, the 'White' Book, records the tidying-
 up process which took place in the 1080s in which the rights and
 jurisdictions of various individuals or bodies over the village of
 Mabouet (Mezvoit) were brought up either by the monks themselves or by
 John¹⁰⁴. The last of these is a confirmation of the foundation of the
 church at Dol by Alan Fergent, the new count of Brittany: not only is
 John named as the moving force behind this, but a date for the
 foundation is also given: anno fundationis eiusdem ecclesiae VIII ab
incarnatione vero Domini MLXXXVI i.e. 1073¹⁰⁵.

The content of the document reproduced by Lobineau and Morice
 is difficult to characterise: it is not entirely presented as a
 record of the foundation of the church at Dol, as the first sentence
 reveals. And whereas it seems to enjoy some kinship with the documents
 in the 'Black' and 'White' cartularies recorded above, the relation-
 ship is a problematical one. The description of the donation of the
 church of Plana Filgeria (or Plana Filcheria = Pleine Fougères, near

Dol) to St Florent-de-Saumur does not quite accord with the description given in the charter in the 'Black' Book, where John rather than William is the donor (although in association with his brother Gilduin) and, as well as the church of Plana Filcheria and its tithes and burial rights gives land in Lanrigan and Combour - a picture similar to, but also significantly different from that given on our document¹⁰⁶. Similarly, the charters recorded in the 'White' Cartulary - although clearly related to the piece reproduced by Lobineau and Morice - are not direct equivalents of the charters apparently referred to there¹⁰⁷. While it might appear at first to be the obvious contender for the title of earliest source on the Dol foundation, it is obviously later than the 'Black' Book version of the Plana Filgeria donation¹⁰⁸, and is written in a narrative style, in which the perfect tense is frequently employed. ('Deinceps dederunt villam Mezvoit....Subinde dedit Johannes....coepit Johannes construere) The lists of witnesses which punctuate the whole at regular intervals - although it should be noted that there are none immediately after the recital of events surrounding the priory at Dol - in no way detracts from its retrospective appearance, simply giving the impression that it has been cobbled together - possibly as a memorandum - from earlier records. And if it was intended as a record of the donations which were brought to St Florent by William - and his half-brothers John and Gilduin - it does not mention the donation of lands at Ceaux by John or the renunciation of rights over them by the monks of Mont-St-Michel, both recorded in the White Book¹⁰⁹. Whatever we are dealing with - and its ultimate derivation and purposes are by no means clear at the moment - it seems more than likely that the document nearest to the foundation of the house at Dol is its confirmation in 1086 by Alan Fergent, count of Britanny, which makes no mention of any intervention by either the pope, Milo of Paris, or an archbishop of distant Benevento.

The question of the date of the reference to Milo and Gregory and indeed of the document as a whole raises many problems. Although given with no date in the editions of Lobineau and Morice, Becquet assigns it to the year 1181: evidently he considers it to be part of the 1181 'enquête' into the affairs of the church of Dol ordered by Henry II of England, which precedes it in Lobineau¹¹⁰. Here he is clearly in error as Lobineau differentiates between the two pieces:

the enquête comes from the 'Titles of the church of Dol', the latter piece, with which we are concerned, from the 'Cartul. abb. S Florentii' (a description retained by Morice who presents the document not with the enquête but as if it were of a date roughly contemporary with the foundation)¹¹¹.

If it is difficult to determine the date at which the document was composed, then we might expect that its provenance at least would be easier to determine. But the simple classification 'Cartul. abb. Sancti Florentii' does nothing to help: rather it only serves to confuse the issue. There are not one but five cartularies of the parent house of St Florentius at Saumur: the early twelfth-century 'Black Book'; the 'white' and 'silver' cartularies of the second half of the twelfth century; the thirteenth-century 'red' book; and a fifteenth-century copy of some of the documents in the 'Black Book'¹¹². As we have already seen, both the Black and White cartularies contain documents connected with the foundation of the priory but none of the five cartularies of St Florent de Saumur contains anything which remotely resembles the piece reproduced by Lobineau. Moreover, Lobineau's imprecision where the provenance of his material is concerned is highly unusual: he gives, for instance, the confirmation of the foundation by Alan Fergent, and correctly assigns it to the White Book. Morice repeats the same unhelpful attribution for our document: he was writing over thirty years after Lobineau, and this would certainly suggest the strong possibility that Lobineau was his source.

Where, then, does the document come from? In the circumstances, the attribution of yet another, missing, cartulary to St Florent would be somewhat excessive, and it seems more reasonable to conclude that Lobineau was working from a fragment which he saw during his investigations in the late seventeenth-early eighteenth century, one which is now, regrettably, proving impossible to trace. As there has been no mention of the document since the French Revolution, it may have been one of the many church manuscripts to disappear then, although we cannot be entirely certain of this. At present, we can only say that the document which refers to the career of Milo of Benevento, whatever it was, probably came from St Florent-de-Saumur and that its style and content suggest some gap in time between the events which it describes and its composition.

A late date does not necessarily deprive the references to Gregory VII and to Milo of their validity; but the obscurity in which this particular document is shrouded makes it essential to examine further the motives and circumstances behind its composition. One obvious quarter to which we might turn for help is the Registrum of Gregory VII, who does indeed write about the church in Dol. His letters provide the outline of a highly interesting story¹¹³. The bishop of Dol, Juhellus, who had ruled since 1039 was deposed on account of his living with a woman who had borne him several children, but only in 1075 (he had enjoyed the support of William I of England who was campaigning in the area at the time). The populace then demanded that Gilduin, a canon of Dol, should be consecrated in his place: but Gregory then wrote to them saying that he could not appoint a person of such youth to the office of bishop and was sending instead Ivo, abbot of St Mélanie of Rennes (This Ivo or Eventius is the bishop mentioned in the document concerning the Dol priory). Gregory also wrote several times to William of England urging him to give up his support of the disreputable Juhellus who, in addition to his other sins, had intruded himself by simony and had married his daughters off to the local nobility¹¹⁴.

Gilduin, the youthful canon of Dol, was to be canonised as St Gilduin of Dol and was a scion of the house of Combour and half-brother of John of Dol and of William who was to become abbot of St Florent de Saumur¹¹⁵ - in other words, he himself was involved in the foundation of the Dol priory and closely related to the two other major figures in the document. In these circumstances, if Gregory had intervened in the foundation and given it his approval - although why he should have needed to do this is not at all clear - we should expect to find some reference to it in his letters of 1076-8 when he was dealing with the case of the diocese of Dol. A search reveals nothing in which either the projected foundation, or Milo dean of Paris, or even Milo, Archbishop of Benevento is mentioned.

Was the cell of St Florent-sous-Dol really founded by papal authority and by the testimony of Milo, first dean of Paris and then appointed by the pope to the office of Archbishop of Benevento? Gregory's letters give us no clue to suppose that it was; but here we must bear in mind recent work by Murray and Hoffmann on the correspondence of Gregory VII¹¹⁶. On the one hand they dispose of the idea

that there exists a huge gap in our knowledge of the pope's correspondence - Murray believes that the notion that many of Gregory's letters were not recorded in the Registrum and have consequently gone missing is mistaken. Conversely, Murray also emphasises Gregory's dependence upon legates and other messengers to convey his wishes verbally, or instigate negotiations on his behalf: so the intervention of Milo is perhaps comprehensible in this light¹¹⁷. But even if we are prepared to accept that this obscure priory in Brittany was approved by the pope himself, for reasons which are not immediately apparent, how are we to interpret the reference to Milo which spans two stages in his career - dean and archbishop - and appears to date from some time after the event? Moreover, the foundation of the Dol priory took place, as the confirmation by Alan Fergent states, in 1078, three years after the death of Archbishop Milo of Benevento; and this confirmation makes no reference to any role played by Gregory or even Milo in these events. Is it really possible to reconcile all this conflicting information?

Nothing certain has emerged so far from this discussion; but Murray's investigation of the Registrum of Gregory VII has certainly seemed to diminish the concept of 'missing letters' although it has perhaps reinforced the possibility that Gregory would be prepared to use a churchman such as the dean of Paris in negotiations on his behalf in an affair such as this. This recalls Becquet's account of Milo's career, which is itself in part founded on the evidence of the document under discussion: he maintains that Gregory was attracted to the reforming stance which Milo exhibited and so was anxious to place him in the important archdiocese of Benevento¹¹⁸. Milo's reforming and moral stance is demonstrated, according to Becquet, by the verse-epistle directed against him by Fulcoie of Beauvais in which - again, according to Becquet - Milo's distaste for clerical marriage, an important issue at this period, is clearly exhibited. The tone of the poem is hostile - Milo is being slandered by a supporter of the 'shameless simoniac' Archbishop Manasses of Rheims. Does the poem demonstrate that Milo, as Becquet argues, was a suitable indeed an obvious candidate to be entrusted with papal business and for high office in the church?

The poem Miloni decano Parisiensi directa zelotipiam calumpniatur is the nineteenth in a series of twenty-six verse epistles by the French poet, Fulcoie of Beauvais who was, according to his latest editor, 'one of the most distinguished literary figures of the eleventh century'¹¹⁹. Although this editor, Colker, is unable to assign any precise date to this series of compositions he considers that they were written at irregular intervals throughout his life: 'Epistle twenty-five', for instance, 'may have been written in old age'¹²⁰. This negates to some extent Becquet's belief that the verses were the product of a regretted and regrettable youth. Epistle nineteen presents Milo in a most unfavourable light. The poet urges Milo, whom he accuses of 'jealousy' to consider the story of Venus and Mars, but warns him that he will not escape punishment like Mars¹²¹. His avoidance of marriage is an excuse: Te sic excusas quoniam sponsale recusas¹²². Milo, apparently has argued that he wishes to be the sole lover of a beautiful woman and that it is unfair for him to have to suffer a rival, but also that a plain girl would not do for him, and that in his case chastity is difficult¹²³. 'What' enquires Fulcoie, 'do you want with a virgin and a nun?..... I have given you the answers that the woman whom your violence has injured has already given you....the fault was yours and not hers'¹²⁴. Milo, unlike the bee which does good and harm by turns, brings only grief. A man who takes the passive role in love cannot take the active: nature gave the former role to women and the latter to men. 'Your practise', Fulcoie concludes, 'is an abuse. You should not flee a wrong, only to do worse'¹²⁵.

The considerable obscurity of the poem - much of which, in any case, is taken up with Fulcoie's account of the story of Mars and Venus - is to a great extent relieved when a comparison is made with Fulcoie's tenth verse-letter 'To Fulcrad, Archdeacon of Laon: the invective of a married priest against sodomy'¹²⁶. It is not clear whether Fulcoie is the married priest but he declares that marriage is a much lesser fault in a priest than homosexuality and ends with the injunction 'do what is bad in order to avoid worse'¹²⁷. The moralistic tone of this conclusion and its terms - although not perhaps the sentiments expressed - closely resembles that of Epistle nineteen, and it is clear that in the latter work, Fulcoie is urging Milo that clerical marriage, from which Milo flees, is to be

preferred to homosexual practises. Besides, 'a man who takes the passive role in love cannot learn to take the active' - from which we may safely conclude that Milo's homosexuality was, in Fulcoie's view, beyond redemption. Milo's claims that he could only accept the notion of himself as the sole lover of a beautiful woman, that an ugly one would not suffice, and that chastity was difficult for him are all viewed as excuses for his present state - one which is evidently highly distasteful to Fulcoie. Milo's hatred of marriage, which Becquet takes as a sign of reforming zeal, is rooted, not in any devotion to the church but in his own sexual preferences.

But is the verse-epistle to be taken at face value? A major part of Becquet's argument is that it cannot be entirely trusted as it was composed by an avowed supporter of a notorious opponent of the Gregorian Reform¹²⁸. Fulcoie was, it is true, a supporter of Archbishop Manasses of Rheims: the dedication of his Uterque and the content of the second, seventh, and twenty-sixth epistles illustrates the relationship between the two men which is evidently that of admiring protege and generous patron¹²⁹. But Manasses, despite his opposition to Gregory VII cannot be classed as an opponent of reform tout court, although as Williams points out, it is customary to describe him in this way. The facts of the case, however, are considerably more complex than this description would suggest.

The dispute between Manasses and the papacy is much better illustrated in its intermediate and later stages than in its origins: its original cause appears to have lain in some obscure dispute within the chapter at Rheims. The chapter split by 1076 into pro and anti-Manasses factions, and the latter group lost no time in complaining to the papal legate Hugh of Die about their grievances. Here they seem to have had some genuine causes for complaint: as early as June 1073 Gregory had written to Manasses admonishing him for diverting the property of St Rémi to his own use, abusing the monks, and delaying over the appointment of a new abbot to the house. And he had to remonstrate once again when, in 1075, Manasses hesitated over the deposition of an unsatisfactory bishop of Chalons¹³⁰. Yet it is instructive to note that at this stage no accusations of intrusion by simony had been made. According to Hugh of Flavigny, it was at the council of Autun in 1077 that Manasses was first accused of this crime; but Hugh's testimony on this point is almost

certainly unreliable. Nowhere in the papal correspondence on the subject, as Williams points out, does the charge of simony appear amongst the numerous complaints about Manasses: the archbishop's rise can be attributed to another potent influence. Writing to Gregory VII after his deposition and excommunication, Manasses insists that this was due to the manoeuvring of his enemies, in particular bishop Helinand of Laon 'whose hatred remains.....because of the episcopal office which he lost in the presence of your dignity and I obtained through the influence of your paternity'. In short, Manasses had been the preferred candidate of the archdeacon Hildebrand who had used his influence with Alexander II to secure for him the position of Archbishop of Rheims¹³¹.

Manasses thus emerges not as the 'shameless simoniac' evoked by Becquet but as an ambitious churchman, or perhaps even a potential reformer, who failed to live up to expectations. This does not of itself necessarily contradict Becquet's assumption that he was hostile to reform; but once again it is clear that Becquet is mistaken in his judgement of the man. Manasses was certainly at odds with Gregory, but either did not wish to abandon, or did not wish to be seen to abandon the ideals of the reform movement. In April 1079 he convoked a provincial council at Soissons. 'Its decrees' writes Williams, 'are of considerable interest. They deal especially with infractions of the Truce of God, but they also confirm the papal prohibitions of clerical marriages and the holding of churches by laymen. In addition, they denounce usury, deny the secular power the right to tax the clergy, and forbid the clerks to bear arms'¹³².

It is obvious that, whatever Manasses' shortcomings may have been - and in the field of ecclesiastical politics and administration of offices they were considerable - he had no desire to be seen as an opponent of the reforming party within the church. Fulcoie could not have been expected to imbibe anti-reform sentiments from his patron, nor would it in any case have been politic for him to express any such sentiments in writing. His own view of the quarrel between Gregory and Manasses can be judged by Epistle two which is addressed to the pope. Fulcoie writes to Gregory in extremely flattering terms, congratulating him on his attainments and begging him to forgive Manasses who would - he assures the destinee - be a good friend to him¹³³. Fulcoie himself appears to have been a conventionally pious

man who thought of becoming a monk, and the sincerity of his sentiments may be judged from his discussion of this idea with Raoul le Verd and St Bruno, the founder of the Carthusians¹³⁴. Once the poem addressed to Milo is seen against this background, it is hard to accept Becquet's elaborate logical gymnastics. Milo may be the object of our sympathy for providing a target for such harsh disapproval; but he was not the victim of the outright and politically-inspired slander in which Becquet would have us believe. Fulcoie's poem cannot be used to demonstrate that Milo had any connections with the reform movement: rather it strongly suggests that the way of life of this particular dean of Paris would not have recommended him to Gregory VII as a suitable candidate for the office of archbishop of Benevento.

None of this evidence surrounding the verse-letter of Fulcoie of Beauvais is new: it can all be gleaned from Colker's edition of the poems which is the one used by Becquet. Nevertheless it is hard not to view the poem in a light completely different from that in which Becquet sees it. And when taken into consideration along with the date of the Dol foundation (1078) and the earliest known reference to a new dean of Paris (John, in 1079), the testimony of the poem serves to indicate that there may, in fact, be no real connection between Milo of Paris and Milo of Benevento. The only evidence for this is the document recording the foundation of the priory at Dol and this, as we have seen, gives every appearance of having been composed after the event which it describes. In the absence of the document itself it is difficult to suggest exactly when it may have been written; but the Grandmontine house of La Haye-sur-Angers was founded before 1186, thus providing a centre for the diffusion of the Life of Stephen of Muret in north-western France, and a Milo with whom to associate a dean of Paris possibly involved in the Dol foundation¹³⁵. The coincidence of the proximity of the dates of death of Milo of Paris and Milo of Benevento can hardly be regarded as concrete evidence of any connection between the two men. The Paris necrology refers simply to the death, on February 22 of the dean Milo, who left to the church some vineyards near Vitry:

obiit Milo decanus qui dedit nobis domum ad stationem in
claustro trium ferculorum & 13 arpennos vineam apud Vitri¹³⁶

There is nothing here to suggest any promotion to the archdiocese of

Benevento; and it should be remembered that until Vipera's authority came to be accepted by Bolland in the seventeenth century, there was no general agreement that Milo of Benevento died on February 23rd.

The picture of Milo of Benevento which emerges after a reconsideration of the French evidence for his career, is quite different from the popular conception of him as exemplified in the Book of Saints (1966) where the careers of the dean of Paris and the Archbishop of Benevento are run together to form an interesting but inaccurate whole. It is now possible to distinguish between the two Milos, one a dean of Paris, probably from 1071-1079, a homosexual whose way of life brought down upon his own head the sharp disapproval of a contemporary poet and churchman. (The decanate of Paris does not appear to have enjoyed a particularly distinguished series of incumbents at this period - Milo's predecessor Odo is also lampooned by Fulcoie, in his case for theft! 137) On the other hand we have archbishop Milo of Benevento, a native of the Auvergne, a man of holy life who admired the austerities of the hermits of Calabria and preached sermons in their honour to the people of Benevento. Yet, when qualified by the evidence compiled by Mabillon, Becquet and the other historians whose work has already been discussed, this charming if sketchy portrait of the Italian archbishop becomes even less clear-cut.

Much has already been made of the major chronological discrepancy within the Life itself - the account of Stephen's pilgrimage to see relics which had not yet arrived in Bari. Even greater difficulties of chronology are raised by the figure of Milo himself. The Maurists in particular were acutely aware of the difficulty of reconciling Stephen's twelve-year stay in his care with a two-years' rule as archbishop - a rule which ended only one, and not four or five years, before Stephen's arrival at Muret. The ingenious solution proposed by Martene and Durand, to the effect that Stephen and Milo met when the latter was still in France as a deacon of the church of Paris must now be discarded in view of our discovery of two separate Milos. The closure of this convenient loophole for the perplexed historian (under which heading we cannot include Becquet who prefers to smooth things over with a reference to the 'imprecisions' of an author simply 'ill at ease with the chronology of his hero's youth') must surely argue in favour of a re-examination and re-evaluation of the Italian evidence for Milo of Benevento.

C (iii) The Italian Evidence for Milo of Benevento

Becquet's presentation of the Italian sources which deal with Milo of Benevento is, in several respects, rather less than clear. He refers to 'a chronicle' which records Milo's succession in 1074, and also to 'an act of 1074-5' issued by the archbishop. His acquaintance with the former stems, according to his foot-notes, from an edition by Pertz in the Monumenta Germaniae Historica, and from a citation by Martène and Durand¹³⁸. Perhaps this is why he writes of 'a chronicle' in the singular, as Milo's accession and death are recorded not in one but in two related chronicles which, with a third fragment, are collectively known as the Annales Beneventani. Becquet's indecision over the date of the synodal act issued by Milo is less easily explained: even in the edition by Ughelli to which Becquet refers, it is clearly dated 1 April 1075¹³⁹.

The latest edition of the Annales Beneventani is that of the distinguished Italian historian Ottorino Bertolini and is to be found in volume 42 of the Bullettino dell' Istituto Storico Italiano¹⁴⁰. The two codices which contain the Annales with the references to Milo - Vat Lat 4928 and 4939 - are generally believed to originate in the famous Beneventan monastery of St Sofia, despite a lack of overt indications to this effect, even roughly contemporary with their composition¹⁴¹. However, they do record the succession of abbots of St Sofia and the calendar in VL 4928 includes a specially decorated entry for St Mercurius, the patron saint of St Sofia. The Annales only occupy a small portion of the codices, the composition of which is as follows:

<u>VL 4928</u>		<u>VL 4939</u>	
ff 1r-8v	<u>Annales</u>	ff 1r-15r	<u>Annales</u>
9r-14v	calendar	16r-22r	canonical collection of bulls and decretals
(16r-17v	missing)	23r-24v	catalogue of dukes and princes of Benevento
17r-24v	treatise on computation of dates	25r-26r	three diplomas of Arichis I
25r-102r	breviary	26v-217v	' <u>Liber Praeceptorum</u> ' of St Sofia ¹⁴²
102v-363v	psalter - <u>'psalterium decani Johannis'</u>		

The entries for Milo in the Annales read:

Vat Lat 4928

MLXXIIII XII electus est domnus Madelmus et consecratus in abbatia sancta Sophie a domno papa Gregorius. et Milo fit archiepiscopus

MLXXV XIII Robbertus dux perrexit super Salernum quem tenebat Gisolfus princeps cognatus suus et sedit super eius a mense magii usque in festivitate Sancte Lucie et in ipse nocte cepit eandem civitatem. obiit Milo archiepiscopus

Vat Lat 4939

MLXXIIII XII an XXXVI domni Landulfi et II an septimi Gregorii pape. Milo consecratus est in archiepiscopum Beneventi et domnus Madelmus in abbatem Sancta Sophie.

MLXXV XIII an XXXVII domni Landolfi et III an septimi Gregorii pape. obiit Milo archiepiscopus.¹⁴³

Bertolini, who compares the two works with other southern Italian chronicles considers that they were composed independently of each other but probably shared, for some sections at least, a common source - hence the marked similarities and even more marked differences between the two¹⁴⁴.

The entries in the Annales of Vat Lat 4928 (A1) stop at the year 1113 although the anonymous author has ruled and numbered divisions up to the year 1166. (Bertolini fails to indicate that the writer is, in fact, completing an 8f gathering by doing this). This, taken in conjunction with the regularity of the entry-spaces from 1114 on may be taken to indicate that the author was working in 1113¹⁴⁵.

However, Bertolini then moves from this fairly... reasonable position to one of indecision, and gives 1113-18 as the period of composition because the writer fails to mention the 'important events' for Benevento of late 1118¹⁴⁶. He is, on the other hand, certain that the work dates from before 1120, because on f 102v (Bertolini - f 100v) of the codex appear the words 'psalterium decani Johannis' and, according to the chronicler Falco of Benevento, a dean named John was alive around 1120¹⁴⁷. Setting aside the possibility that the Annales and the psalter, although in a similar hand were not necessarily bound in one volume at the time of composition, there is no need for me to comment further at this stage on the extremely tenuous nature of this assumption.

Bertolini considers that the Vat Lat 4939 Annales (A2) were written in the year 1119, because of the diversity of hands in the entries after this point which contrasts with the regularity of the

entries up to 1119; and he dates the codex as a whole to this year, because the compiler of the Liber Praeceptorum states, in the preamble, that he is writing 'anno.....millesimo centesimo nono decimo' and because the last entry in this main hand dates from 1119¹⁴⁸.

The 'act' issued by Milo in 1075 is given by Ughelli in volumes VIII and X of his Italia Sacra: in the latter volume it forms part of the Chronicon Beneventani Monasterii Sanctae Sophiae which derives from the Liber Praeceptorum of Vat Lat 4939¹⁴⁹. The Liber Praeceptorum is a monastic cartulary in six parts which purports to contain documents relating to the property-rights and jurisdiction of St Sofia in Benevento over a period from the eighth century to 1130 (although entries in the main hand only go up to a document of 1119)¹⁵⁰. The Liber Praeceptorum is an extremely attractive collection which contains many drawings, the majority of which have been coloured by the artist - although it is unusual in that many of the texts in the sixth and final section have been corrected, presumably by the writer, in red ink¹⁵¹. It is interesting to note that Becquet seems quite unaware of the close relationship between the Italian sources for Milo, two of which are contained in the one codex - Vat Lat 4939 - and the other in a codex from the same house which is closely related to the first.

The document in which Milo of Benevento features is a synodal act of 1075 and runs as follows:

In nomine sanctae et individuae trinitatis. Anno dominicae incarnatio millesimo septuagesimo quinto, Domino Gregorio septimo summo pontifice Romane sedi secundo anno pontificatus sui feliciter praesidente. Cum ego Milo Dei nutu Beneventanae urbis archiepiscopus primo anno nostri praesulatus more ecclesiastico sollempniter synodali auctoritate in basilica sanctae Dei genetricis & virginis Mariae agerem una cum Goffrido Aversano episcopo seu et coepiscopis et abbatibus ad nostram diocesim pertinentibus, scilicet Bernardo Agathensis, Adelberto Bobianensi, Petro Guardensi, Ruggero Civitatensi, Gilberto Telesino, Rubberto Florintinensi, Nicolao Termulensi, Azzo Lucerino, Willelmo Larinensi, Maynardo Arianensi, Johanne nostrae ecclesiae archipresbytero, Alberico abbate Sancti Modesti, Savino abbate Sancti Lupi, necnon domno Landolfo principe et Stephano schuldachis ceterisque nobilitatis Beneventanae cum pluribus pondus testimonii habentibus. Inter alia qui hinc inde agebantur et referebantur, Madelmus coenobii Sanctae Sophiae abbas surrexit in medio conventu et proclamavit super episcopum Draconarii nomine Campo pro duabus ecclesiis ad predictum monasterium Sanctae Sophiae pertinentibus,

quarum altera dicitur Sancta Maria in Olicina, altera vero Sancti Benedicti in eadem civitate sita. Ad haec episcopus Campo de hoc negotio requisitus respondit: olim quidem illas duas predictas ecclesias ad praephatum monasterium vere pertinuisse per quaedam munima, sed postea furata fuisse, et taliter iam dictas ecclesias ad suum jus redactas fuisse et usque modo jure tenuisse. Tunc praedictus abbas praetulit praeceptum sigillatum in quo continebatur quomodo predecessore beatae memoriae Oudalrico archiepiscopo confirmatum et testatam fuisse et de illis duabus ecclesiis ad praedictum monasterium Sanctae Sophiae, ipsius monasterii abbate Amico, nostre, adversus Leonem tunc temporis Draconariae ecclesiae presidentem in presentia quidem Archiepiscopi Oudalrici et Dodo Rosellani Episcopi sed et Berenardus episcopi et cancelarii sanctae Romanae sedis Domini Nicolay Papae legatorum aliorumque Episcoporum seu abbatum qui synodali tunc conventu intererant. Cumque preceptum perlegeretur, Maynardus Arianensis episcopus et Adelferius archidiaconus et Roffridus diaconus et bibliothecarius nostrae ecclesiae, set et plures alii bonii testimonii viri responderunt et consenserunt et confirmaverunt in praesentia nostra ita verum esse sicut in precepto legebatur, eo quod salve fide sine ulla falsitate ita fideliter reminiscerentur esse. Itaque episcopus iam saepe dictus Campo praeter suam existimationem audiens et intelligens veritatem et scriptis et bonorum virorum testimonium, nolens alia per aliis obicere, maxime in tali conventu et quod non decet episcopum, vel aliquem Catholicum virum in re vera angulos ubi non sunt quaerere, ultra nihil habens^{quid} respondere cunctis audientibus sicut justitia dicebant retinuit, ea se deinceps extorrem fieri permisit et numquam se amplius se inde agere cum predicto abbate vel successoribus eius, tantum reservata sibi canonica et parrochiali auctoritate. Propterea ergo nostra benevolentia omnibus quidem obnoxia sed maxime Domingum timentibus et domesticis fidei comes in re mora decrevit in eadem synodo cum omnibus assensu secundum canonicum auctoritatem fieri praeceptum ad partem predicti monasterii, et nostro sigillo corroborari, ac propria manu signari et confirmari. Simul cum predictis episcopis et abbatibus omnisque synodali conventu; ita ut in posterum sine ulla contradictione presentium vel futurorum habeat et possideat predictus abbas cum suis sequacibus iure perpetua predictas ecclesias cum omnibus hodie earum pertinentiis et deinceps affuturis iuxta textum et auctoritatem precepti a nostro predecessore bonae recordationis Oudalrico archiepiscopo de iis ecclesiis ad idem monasterium canonico juri confirmati; nulla ratione Campo saepe dicto episcopo vel successoribus suis vel quibuslibet personis deinceps calumpniatibus vel refragantibus. Scriptum autem per manus Johannis clerici et cantoris nostrae ecclesiae mense martio indictione XIIII. Datum vero per manus supradicti Roffridi diaconi atque bibliothecarii, die . videlicet Kalendarium Aprilium.

Signum Milonis archiepiscopi; Ego qui supra Goffridus Aversanus antistes; Ego qui supra Bernardus Agathensis episcopus; Ego Maynardus supradictus Arianensis episcopus; Signum crucis factus per manus supradicti Petri Guardiensis

Episcopus; Ego qui supra Johannes Archipresbyter; Ego qui supra Sabinus abbas; Ego Rogerius supradicto Civitatensis episcopus; Signum crucis factum per manus Gilberti Telesini Episcopus; Ego Rubbertus supradictus Florentinensis episcopus; Ego qui supra Nicolaus Termolensis Episcopus; Ego qui supra Azzo Lucerinus Episcopus; Ego Willelmus Larinensis subscripsi; Signum crucis factum per manus Sebbaldi abbatis monasterii Domini salvatoris de Telesia; Signum crucis factum per manus supradicti Alberici abbatis^{151a}

The city of Dragonaria was founded, according to Leo of Ostia, in or around 1018 by the catepan Basil Boioannes, along with 'Florentinum, Civitate, and the other cities commonly known as the capitanate, which were populated by inhabitants whom he summoned from the neighbouring territory'¹⁵². Transfers of population were a characteristic feature of Byzantine policy in frontier territory or hostile areas which had formerly been part of the empire¹⁵³; and the cities of the capitanate formed the Byzantine line of defence in southern Italy which Greek catepans before Boioannes, and even before the revolt of Meles and the Normans, had been attempting to reconstitute¹⁵⁴. The foundation-date of the dioceses of Dragonaria and Florentinum are unknown: they are generally presumed to have come into existence at the same time as the cities themselves, as Boioannes elevated the former bishopric of Siponto (which had been united to the archbishopric of Benevento) to the rank of archbishopric and created the new bishoprics of Troia and Dragonaria (and presumably also that of Florentinum although the sources are less forthcoming concerning its foundation than they are on its existence) which depended on Siponto, thus leaving Ascoli, Bovina, and Lucera as the only bishoprics in the area dependent on the Lombard - i.e. Latin - archbishopric of Benevento¹⁵⁵.

We possess no direct information on the origins of the population of either Dragonaria or Florentinum, but a document on Troia, the most important of these cities, indicates that the populace was, as we would expect, of Lombard origin¹⁵⁶, whereas the officials appointed, and the bishop, owed their political although not necessarily their religious allegiance to the Byzantine empire. Liutprand of Cremona, in the tenth century, reported that the Latin rite had been banned throughout southern Italy by Nikephoros Phokas¹⁵⁷; but this even if it were true of Byzantine Calabria - and this must be doubtful - did not hold for Apulia, where, even in Taranto, which was the home of a very strong Greek minority (perhaps

even of a Greek majority, if we accept the mid-twelfth century testimony of Benjamin of Tudela) the episcopate remained Latin in religious orientation¹⁵⁸.

On the eve of the Norman conquest of southern Italy, the bishops of Apulia, Lucania, northern Calabria and the Capitanate maintained ambivalent positions, as men whose religious allegiance lay towards the west but who also owed political allegiance to the Byzantine empire. Byzantine success in generally maintaining this pattern can be largely attributed to the weakness of the papacy and its general lack of interest in southern Italian affairs before the accession of Leo IX¹⁵⁹. But even although cardinal Humbert, not known for any sympathy toward the Greeks, could affirm that there was less traffic in offices in the orthodox church, the new reforming papacy perhaps feared contamination of the Latin clergy by proximity to the married Greek priests, and certainly was unwilling to allow the prestige of the papacy and its control over southern Italian affairs to slide any further. By the 1070s, the emergence of a reforming papacy and the Norman conquest of southern Italy had combined, according to Gay, to produce considerable changes in the episcopal structures of the area. 'The Roman church, renewing with more success the claims which it seemed to have abandoned since the time of Nicholas I, had taken a definite offensive against the Byzantine patriarchate: at Cosenza, Acerenza, and Taranto, everywhere where the two clergies lived in proximity, it profited from the Norman presence to attempt to abolish the Byzantine hierarchy.....'¹⁶⁰

The situation in the synodal document issued by Milo appears to reflect part of this episcopal reorganisation. Aversa, not in Apulia, but part of the former Lombard principate of Capua, was now in Norman territory: it is not clear why its bishop should be assisting Milo in his synodal decisions, but he is not totally out of place at this gathering. The other bishops all come from north-western Apulia, also in Norman hands, and always the most heavily Latinised sector of the former Capitanate. It appears that all the dioceses mentioned were now suffragans of Benevento¹⁶¹: and it is among the list of subscribers to the document that we can find apparent confirmation of its genuineness. The name of Milo himself is not known outside codices Vat Lat 4928 and Vat Lat 4939; but the identity of some of the other participants is confirmed elsewhere. Mainard,

bishop of Arianus (modern Ariano Irpino) is commemorated in an inscription of 1070¹⁶², while several of the other bishops are listed in documents of the period. The first of these is an account of the dedication of the new basilica at Monte Cassino in 1071 (and also of several other, later churches in the monastery) which, though distinct from the Chronicle of Monte Cassino, and differing in several respects from the account of the dedication of the basilica given there, is generally attributed to Leo of Ostia. In this Narratio de consecratione et dedicatione ecclesiae casinensis are named the bishops Albert of Boiano, Nicholas of Termuli, William of Larino, Campo of Dragonaria, and Robert of Florentinum¹⁶³. Campo of Dragonaria also appears as a witness to a transaction of 1075-7 recorded in the cartulary of St Maria di Tremiti; and Robert of Florentinum subscribes a document in the same collection, this time of 1081¹⁶⁴. Bishop Bernard of St Agatha is mentioned, according to Ughelli, in several other documents of the period 1080-90; and Albert of Boiano figures in a diptych of the same period¹⁶⁵. Insofar as its participants are concerned the synod held at Benevento in 1075 is well-attested.

However, another document remains to be taken into account. This is a transaction recorded in the cartulary of the house of St Leonardo di Siponto, a house of regular canons founded at the end of the eleventh century in the south-eastern corner of the Monte Gargano promontory. Its interest lies not only in the names of the witnesses, but in its subject:

Anno MCXXXIII mense iunio (indict. vi) XIII^o anno regnante Roggerio rege. Ego Campus ecclesiae Traconariensis episcopus rogatus a (Iohanne) priore ecclesiae S Leonardi que sita est in territorio Sipontino, de una ecclesia de(serta) qui est in territorio civitatis Traconariae, cuius vocabulum est S Maria in Aulicina que data erat eis ab abbate ecclesiae S Maria Decorate et a domno E(nrico) comite Loritelli, ut nos concedissemus eis ecclesiam desertam; unde nos, consilio abito cum canonicis nostre matris ecclesiae et cum parochianis eiusdem ecclesiae, concessionem fecimus in ecclesia S Leonardi in praesentia R(ober)ti Flor(entinensis) episcopi, cum suis pertinentiis, absque eo quod privilegium nostrum continet de ecclesia suo casali in manu Iohanne priori et fratribus, ut potestatem habe(ant) possidere ecclesiam desertam et debeant nobis reddere per unumquemque annum solidum I in assumptione S Mariae, I porcum in Natale, duo muntones in resurrectione Domini, quando visum fuerit a probis hominis quod ecclesia reddere[po]ssit. Johannes not.
+ Ego Campus episc me subscripsis. + Ego Robbertus

Florentinensis episc me subscripssi. + Ego Johannes archipresbyter crissi me. + Ego Maginolfus cantor me subscrissi. + Ego Rogerius Basilius t. Ego Guillelmus t.¹⁶⁶

Here we have not only the names of two bishops alleged to be alive and ruling up to seventy-two years before, but the subject of the document is the church of St Maria in Aulicina (= Olicina) mentioned in Milo's synodal document of 1075! Moreover, bishop Campo of Dragonaria is mentioned in a document of 1149 from the same cartulary and the 1143 document is mentioned in a breve recordationis of 1184¹⁶⁷.

The cartulary of St Leonardo of Siponto now exists only in an edition published by Camobreco in 1910, as the original was destroyed in the allied bombing of Naples in 1943¹⁶⁸. The authenticity of the first piece, that of 1143, has nevertheless been accepted by no less an authority than Pratesi, who considers it to be in conformity with the episcopal diplomatic of the period and area¹⁶⁹. Camobreco himself accepts all three documents as genuine; and Robert of Florentinum was present at the third Lateran council of 1179¹⁷⁰. Nevertheless, there still remains the corroborative evidence for the 1075 document: the two pieces from the cartulary of St Maria di Tremiti and the Narratio de consecratione et dedicatione ecclesiae cassinensis. It could well be argued that their collective testimony far outweighs that of the documents from the cartulary of St Leonardo di Siponto and so affirms the reliability of the synodal act of 1075. The only solution to this dilemma lies in a careful examination of the evidence itself.

The two documents from the cartulary of the house on the Tremiti islands, in which Campo and Robert are mentioned run as follows:

(1)

In nomine domini nostri Iesu Christi. Ab incarnatione sua M sentuagesimo VII, principatus domini Pandolfi gloriosi principis XX et VI, anno principatus domini Landolfi magnifici principis filii eius, XI die intrante mense augusti, XIII indictio. Ideoque ego Guidelmo, qui super nomen Buscella vocor, clare facio quia dum in nostram terram sub nostra donatione pertinentes et illam requirentes de nostro domino comite Roberto Lorotello nobis pertinentes, inter quas invenimus duo castella, nomina eorum Civitate de mare et Vena de Causa, que sunt pertinentes monasterio Beate et gloriose

semperque virginis Dei Genetricis Mariae, quæ in Tremitana insula edificata esse videtur, que tenuit Maria uxor mea et habuit illa usque modo in sua potestate et dominavit et fecit quecumque sibi placuit, modo vero inspiratione Dei compunctus sum et divina omnipotentis Dei misericordia rememoravit ipsam Mariam uxorem meam que valde me obsecrare precipit et per semetipsam et per alios suos nuntios quos michi mandavit et dicebat: ut faciatis pro Dei timore et redemptione atque salvatione anime nostre et omnium nostrorum parentum, et reddas ipsa castella cum omnibus hominibus ibi abitantibus, et inantea qui venturi sunt, ut sicut usque modo fuit in nostra ditione, sic reddamus in predicto monasterio cuius antea per legem fuit et rectum est abendum, unde domnus Ferro venerabilis abbas gratia Dei regimen tenere videtur. Ego namque qui supra Guidelmus cum talia audientem protinus preces eius benignas exaudivi sicut ipsa me deprecavit, et accepto consilio a supradicto comite insimulque cum ipsa Maria uxore mea pariter traditionem atque donationem confirmavimus. Unde pro ac re ante presentiam domni Camponi venerabilis pontificis, sancte sedis civitatis Draconarensis et ante presentiam Iohannis iudicis de castello quod Sera vocatur et ante aliorum bonorum hominum qui subter scripti sunt, per bonam nostram voluntatem et pro redemptione anime nostre nostrorumque parentum omnium, ut nichil aliud accipiamus, nisi missas et orationes die noctuque in psalmis et himnis et orationibus et canticis spiritalibus aput celestem patrem sine intermissione habeamus ut in eternam vitam requiem accipiamus, reddimus et tradimus tibi quo supra Ferro venerabili abbati et ad vestrum nuntium quem nobis direxistis ipas predicta castella cum omnibus suis pertinentiis, que sunt infra has fines: de prima parte incipit a foce Fertoris, com medietate fluminis istius et sicut pergit iusta litus mare usque ad Fantinam que est in pede vallone que venit de Vena de Causa; et de alio latere per istum predictum ballonem ascendit per medietatem aque et venit in valle qui dicitur Formili ab occidente parte et exit in via carrara et de carrara pergit in via publica et deinde vadit in quodam balloncello et descendit in Aquamvivam et sicut pergit usque in viam antiquam et vadit ad ulmum et ab ipso ulmo pervenit in viam carraram que vadit per pedes vineis Sancti Petri et per insam viam carraram vadit in vena Silvani; et de tertia parte sicut descendit per ipsam venam Silvani et vadit usque in flumine Fertoris, ubi videtur ex alia parte unus pes oleastri; et de quarta parte per medium ipsum flumen Fertoris usque in mare ad priorem finem. Hec omnia sicut prelegitur reddimus in predicto sancto monasterio et tibi domno Ferro venerabili abbati, una tecum astante atque recipiente Redegardo advocatore tuo, ea vero ratione ut a modo et semper sint quecumque vobis placuerit, sine nostrorumque heredum contrarietate et quorumcumque hominum requisitione. Et hoc quod prelegitur sit semper firmum et stabile et obligamus nos nostrosque heredes ut si aliquod adveniente tempore nos qui supra Guidelmo et Maria voluerimus aliquam intentionem aut contrarietatem facere, ut componamus vos supradicto domno Ferro vel vestris posterioribus c. libri aurei et exinde taciti et reprobi maneamus. Et quicumque

hoc donum sive hoc scriptum frangere aut falsare voluerit, veniat super eum maledictio Domini et pars illius sit cum Iuda traditore Dei. Et hoc brebe semper firmum et stabile permaneat. Quod te Petrum notarium scribere rogavimus. Actus in castello de Serra. Feliciter.

- + Ego supradicto Campo Draconariensis episcopus.
- + Ego Iohannes iudes signum manus mee.
- + Ego Silvester signum manum mee.
- + Ego Roffreda signum manus mee.

(2)

Anno ab incarnatione domini nostri Iesu Christi. MLXXXII indic(tione) V die kalendas dece(m)bris, residente venerabili papa Gregorio VII in Sede apostolatus. Venit domnus Desiderius cardinalis et abbas cenobii Casinensis et dominus Bernardus Papie sancte Romane Ecclesie diaconus, in Civitate, una cum venerabili archiepiscopo Rofrido Beneventanae ecclesie, ad quod pervererunt complures episcopi, inter quos affuerunt domnus Guillielmus Larinensis ac dominus Leo Draconariensis episcopus atque domnus Landulfus Civitatis eiusdem presul, domnusque Rubertus Florentinensis episcopus et dominus Albeltus Montis Corbibi episcopus, aliique plures, nec non et comites, videlicet Robertus et Petro, et Robertus Constantini filius cum suis iudicibus atque magnatibus; tunc iudicatum curie Robberti comitis Lupo et Faydolfus germani regebant, iudicatum curie comitis Petronis Franco iudex regebat. In quorum supradictorum presentia lamentabili voce supradictus dominus Desiderius cardinalis et abbas confessus et se pecasse et Tremetensem abbatiam sibi iniuste tulisse; sed omnipotentem Deum testem invocavit, non ideo illam accepisse quatinus cella fieret Casinensis cenobii, set ut eam gubernaret atque exaltaret: Set meis peccatis exigentibus fraudatus sum a cognatione mea; pro qua causa volo nunc ante vestram presentiam renuntiare atque hunc fratrem Ungrellum abbatem eligere, et consecrationem a domino nostro papa universali accipiat, ut sit libera et in suo iure permaneat, sicuti actis temporibus sub tutela sancte Romane Ecclesie fuit michique aliter non obediat, nisi ceu amicis amico; at tantummodo michi hunc reservo honorem, ut, si iste frater Ungrellus fuerit antea defunctus quam ego, liceat fratres de supradicto cenobio Tremetensis alium sibi abbatem eligere et ad me usque dirigere et ego una cum illo ad dompnum papam pergam, et ab eo consecrationem accipiat; post meum vero obitum, ut iam diximus, in suo iure permaneat. His dictis et ab omnibus confirmatis, fecit me supranominatum Ungrellum a fratribus de cenobio Tremetensis, in abbatiam eligere ante presentiam supradictorum dominorum, scilicet archiepiscopi, episcoporum, comitum, iudicum atque magnatum, eo pacto, ut supradiximus, quatinus in suo iure atque dominio permaneret domus videlicet Sancte et perpetue Virginis Marie Tremetensis cum omnibus suis pertinentiis cunctis temporibus, ut aliquis non haberet ulterius potestatem requirendi nec ipse dompnus Desiderius cardinalis et abbas nec sui successores

me supranominatum Ungrellum abbatem, vel meos successores, vel parum aliquid amplius iubendi. Et si in aliquo tempore ipse videlicet^{supra} nominatus dompnus Desiderius cardinalis abbas, vel meos successores querere, vel sui successores querimoniam facere presumpserint, vani et vacui ex hoc querela remaneant et magis vituperationem quam honorem accipiant. Et he karta firma et stabilis maneat absque omni violatione. Et qui hanc violare temptaverit ab omnipotenti Deo et ab universi cetu iustorum sit sequestratus et anathematus vinculo constrictus. Hanc renuntiationis kartulam scripsi ego Iohannes notarius rogatus a supradicto Ungrello abb(ate), dompno Desiderio cardinali et venerabili abb(ate) iubente eo quod intus fui. Acta in civitate Draconaria. Feliciter.¹⁷¹

The cartulary of St Maria di Tremiti has been edited in three volumes by Petrucci for the Istituto Storico Italiano: Significantly, the earliest manuscript version dates from the thirteenth century¹⁷². The first document given here appears to be a straightforward account of a restitution to the monastery of property originally given to it by the Lombard count Tasselgard, who possessed property in Larina, in 1048-9. A Norman seigneur, William of Buscella, is returning (with the consent of his wife - who appears to be the actual owner of the property - and of count Robert of Loritello) the two castles of Vena de Causa (= Venacquosa) and Civitate de mare (= Civita à mare). The editor accepts the document as genuine, despite some difficulties over the date, which he is forced to give as '1075-7(?)': he concludes that we can attribute the document to a period between the date given and the year to which the indiction corresponds - 'sia pure dubitativamente'¹⁷³.

This ready acceptance of the document's reliability is surprising in view of the considerable difficulties which confront anyone attempting to assign a definite date to it - difficulties which Petrucci indeed rehearses, but which he is apparently willing to set aside. The year is given as 1077, while the indiction (XIII) corresponds to 1075, thus leading Petrucci to his approximation, an approximation which might be permissible, in other circumstances. However, the third chronological element which is given only serves to accuse rather than acquit the document. The year of Pandolf's reign is given as twenty-six when, in fact, Pandolf IV of Benevento commenced his reign in August 1056: 1075 would have been the nineteenth year of his reign. But the inclusion of Pandolf in the

document at all is highly surprising, as he perished at the battle of Montesarchio in February 1074¹⁷⁴. Surely if the document were genuine, the writer would have been aware of the death of this important personage. The - now remote - possibility that the document is entirely authentic is further decreased by the incorrect regnal year assigned to Landolf VI, who had ruled since 1038, and was Pandolf's father and not his son! Moreover, if we settle on the date of August 1077 for the original composition of the document, matters are further complicated by the fact that Landolf, the last of the Lombard princes of Benevento, died in this month¹⁷⁵.

The confused and contradictory information given in our document only serves to reinforce the idea that the pieces from St Leonardo di Siponto could well be genuine, and that Campo is a twelfth-century figure assigned to the eleventh for the purposes of dressing up an important but unimpressive document with the names of Landolf and Pandolf also appearing in the arenga to reinforce its authenticity. In reality, on closer examination, these two names do nothing of the sort. Of the fifteen documents in the cartulary which are dated by reference to the regnal years of the Lombard princes of Benevento, as well as by the Christian era and indiction-number, the dates only agree completely amongst themselves in two cases¹⁷⁶. It is quite likely that we are dealing here not with out-and-out forgeries but with the not unusual reworking and embroidering of already-existing material.

The original donation of the castles of Vena de Causa and Civitade de Mare by a Lombard noble, followed by their restitution by a Norman fit in well with the pattern of Apulian history from the 1040s onwards - it is only the incidentals, both in the first donation and in our document, which do not ring true. A cartulary, after all, usually consists of copies of documents in the possession of a monastery, and its compilation can afford great scope for embroiderings and even downright forgeries, almost always committed with an eye to improving the house's position as far as its property-rights were concerned. The earliest surviving version of the Tremiti cartulary dates from the first half of the thirteenth century - thus giving the opportunity for the transposition of the name of a twelfth-century bishop into the eleventh century. It is possible that

a bishop of Dragonaria did witness the original document which presumably was set down at some time in the third quarter of the eleventh century, although it could possibly be of a rather later date; on the other hand the name of a local bishop may have been added for no other reason than to lend an air of greater authenticity to the transaction. This latter notion cannot be dismissed out of hand as the involvement of the bishops of Dragonaria in the affairs of St Maria di Tremiti if it ever really existed in the eleventh century ceased in the twelfth, according to the evidence of the cartulary; but it recommenced - began? - in the thirteenth when in 1237 bishop John reported to the pope on the deplorable state into which the monastery had fallen, inaccessible on account of the presence of Slav pirates, with whom the abbot and monks were, apparently, known to be in league¹⁷⁷. The composition of the cartulary itself seems to antedate these events by two or three decades and to have either just preceded or coincided with the beginning of the decline of the once-prosperous Benedictine house. Its position by the 1230s is poignantly set out in an inventory - not part of the cartulary itself - which together with a list of the holdings of the library and treasury of the house, gives a long list of properties now held 'unjustly' by various persons; and among them, significantly, are the wood and island of Vena de Causa¹⁷³.

These observations concerning the composition of the cartulary must also be applied to a document of 1081 in which bishop Robert of Florentinum is mentioned. The more specific problems raised by this document are due only in part to the dates given within it - the indiction given corresponds not to the year 1082 as the writer believes, but to 1081, hence Petrucci's decision to assign it to 1081¹⁷⁴. However, other problems are created by the location of its composition, the subject in hand, and most of all, the identity of some of the participants in the synod which gave rise to the document.

The initial question surrounding the document is that of the place of its composition and of the synod which resulted in its composition. The synod or convocation seems to have taken place at Civitate; but the document concludes 'Acta in civitate Dragonaria. Feliciter'. Petrucci believes that the document was drawn up at Dragonaria after the events at Civitate; but this does not seem a very satisfactory solution, and it is more likely, if the document

were genuine, that a scribal error had resulted in the reduction of 'civitate Dragonaria' to 'Civitate'¹⁸⁰.

But the subject-matter of this particular piece serves to cast strong doubts on the possibility of its being genuine. It contains a renunciation by abbot Desiderius of Monte Cassino of the great abbey's claims to exercise jurisdiction over the island house:

the cardinal and abbot Desiderius confessed in a doleful voice that he had sinned and unjustly held the abbacy of Tremiti for himself; but he invoked almighty God as a witness that he had not accepted it in order to make it a cell of Monte Cassino, but in order to govern it and raise it up.....I wish now, in your presence, to renounce it and to elect brother Ungrellus abbot.....

181

Why Desiderius should have made this confession in 1081 is not at all clear. Relations between Monte Cassino and St Maria di Tremiti were, during the second half of the eleventh century, extremely complex, with the older house apparently - to judge from the intermittent and often biased evidence at our disposal, constantly attempting to bring the island monastery under its influence¹⁸². Tremiti, despite the deposition of one of its abbots by Desiderius and his replacement by a totally unsuitable candidate - thus giving Desiderius yet another reason to meddle in its affairs - put up a spirited defence of its independence. The last known clash between the two houses before 1081 occurred in 1071: its outcome was that Desiderius (and this is according to Leo of Ostia, whom one would expect to display a Cassinese bias, if any) was forced to recognise - quasi nauseans - the government of abbot Ferro, although the latter was responsible to Desiderius, or to the pope himself, if Desiderius should die¹⁸³. The solution was approved in the second half of 1073 by Gregory VII, who recognised Desiderius as custodian and defender of Tremiti - but only in the name of the Holy See¹⁸⁴. This compromise, with Ferro, the leader of the Tremite independence party definitely recognised as abbot but with Monte Cassino still exercising some hold over it does not appear to be sufficiently favourable to the Tremite to produce in 1081 a complete confession of error on Desiderius's part together with a somewhat feeble attempt to control abbatial elections; and there is no record of his nominee Ungrellus, who is only mentioned in our document ever having governed St Maria di Tremiti. Indeed, the redoubtable Ferro remained in control until 1093 and perhaps even until 1096¹⁸⁵. Moreover, popes from Urban II to

Calixtus II recognised Monte Cassino's jurisdiction over Tremiti, even if they did stress the latter house's freedom from episcopal jurisdiction and its title to all its possessions: only under Anastasius IV (1153-5) did Tremiti disappear from the list of Cassinese dependencies¹⁸⁶.

Viewed in the light of these considerations, the document of 1091 - or 1082 - could well turn out to be a later forgery designed to counteract the papal view of Tremiti's situation. It is noteworthy, in this context, that Urban II confirmed Tremiti's dependence in a bull of 1097¹⁸⁷; but in the Tremite cartulary there is also a privilege of unknown date, but placed by Petrucci in 1093, which confirms Tremiti's independence - sub tutela et protectione sedis apostolice. This document is considered by Gay to be 'incomplete', while Petrucci is of the opinion that, as the diplomatic is not that of the papal chancellery of the reign of Urban II, it was drawn up in Tremiti and presented to the pontiff for his approval¹⁸⁸. It seems to have escaped Petrucci that it could, of course, simply be a forgery manufactured by a house wishing to extricate itself from the Cassinese clutches¹⁸⁹.

Despite all this (and the dubious nature of some of the later papal privileges recognising the 'independence' of St Maria di Tremiti¹⁹⁰) Petrucci believes that the 1081/2 document is genuine and that Desiderius did indeed recant under pressure from Tremiti itself and to the relief of the bishops and feudal lords of Molise, the Capitanate, and the Monte Gargano area. The names of the feudal lords present at the synod do have an authentic ring: they are Robert of Asclettin, count of Vieste, who is mentioned in a Tremite charter of 1065¹⁹¹; Peter count of Lesina, who figures in a Tremite charter of 1056¹⁹²; and the aggressively independent Robert of Devia, who is mentioned in the cartulary of the year 1054¹⁹³. But the episcopal participants are another matter. Roffridus of Benevento is attested from other sources¹⁹⁴; Landulf of Civitate was alive in 1089¹⁹⁵; Leo of Dragonaria is mentioned in the Liber Praeceptorum of St Sofia, Benevento, in two documents of 1051 (Petrucci is incorrect when he says that Leo is unknown outside the Tremite cartulary)¹⁹⁶; and William of Larino is one of the bishops present at the dedication of the Cassinese basilica in 1071, according to the Narratio de dedicatione¹⁹⁷. We will return presently to the two latter figures: for the moment we can concentrate on Robert of Florentinum and Albertus

- or Albeltus - of Monte Corvino.

If the evidence of the cartulary of St Leonardo di Siponto is reliable, then bishop Robert of Florentinum is - barring the possibility of a coincidence of names between a later and an earlier bishop - a twelfth-century figure transposed into the eleventh century in the Tremite cartulary. The circumstances of the composition of the document in which he is named are indeed suspicious; but there is not, in the evidence offered so far, any absolutely conclusive evidence that a forger has been at work. The name of Albeltus (Albertus) of Monte Corvino does, however, throw further light on the subject. Of this dignitary, Petrucci notes that:

We are talking, in all probability, of St Albertus, bishop of Montecorvino, whom historians and students of hagiography are undecided about assigning to the eleventh century or the twelfth (cf. Dictionnaire d'histoire et géographie ecclésiastique I col 1436; Klewitz, 'Zur Geschichte' p 50); the identification - which seems secure to us - with the Albert present at this meeting will resolve the question definitively¹⁹⁸.

Petrucci is correct when he speaks about the problems raised by the dates of this saint and bishop; but the question was definitively resolved not by his edition of this document, but by the Dollandists in the Acta Sanctorum. Papebroch notes that the date of his death is given by Ughelli as 1037, but that this is a misreading for 1127: and the writer of the entry in the Dictionnaire to which Petrucci refers us accepts his conclusions¹⁹⁹! Even if Albertus had only just commenced his rule in 1031, this would give him a reign of approximately forty-six years in toto; and this - the lowest possible figure - seems to me to be on the high side. It is more probable that we are dealing with the case of another twelfth-century figure added to a document which is in whole or in part a forgery; and, as we have seen, the reasons behind this particular forgery are not hard to seek²⁰⁰.

But even if it is highly probable that the references in the Tremite cartulary to Campo of Dragonaria and Robert of Florentinum are the work of a twelfth or thirteenth century forger - and we have

not yet dealt with the important question of why he should use these particular names - the probability is not converted into a certainty until the Narratio de dedicatione et consecratione ecclesiae casinensis has been examined, because there Campo and Robert are named again with forty-four other cardinals bishops and archbishops who were, apparently, present at the consecration of Desiderius's great new basilica in 1071. This account is generally considered to be the work of the writer of the first part of the Monte Cassino Chronicle, Leo of Ostia. Leo is not named as the author anywhere in the Narratio itself nor does he elsewhere mention its composition: but it has been assigned to him, on the basis of internal evidence, since the seventeenth century. If the Narratio really is Leo's work, then the references to Campo and Robert cannot be the work of a twelfth-century - or later - forger as Leo died between 1114 and 1118 and is considered to be a reliable and painstaking historian.

The Narratio de dedicatione is contained in Codex Casinensis 47 (ff 24 ff). It is written in a twelfth-century beneventan hand which has never been identified as that of Leo. Codex Casinensis 47 also contains the famous Cassinese necrology, the main entries of which were completed in 1159²⁰¹. Its attribution to Leo was made first by Peregrini, who points first to the author's declaration that he will describe elsewhere and in more detail the proportions and splendour of the new basilica of 1071 - which are the subjects of the last section of Leo's contribution to the Chronicle chapters 23-33 of Book III:

Quantitatem autem ipsius ecclesiae, et qualitatem, seu ornamento, quondam non fuit mei propositi ex integro in hoc sermone describere, et alio loco cum reliquis operibus predicti domni abbatis Deo volente, comite vita pendentur, id tantum quanta gloria quantaque frequentia sit consecrata, pro posse narrabo²⁰².

The author of this is evidently also aiming at a sort of Gesta abbatis, and Desiderius's deeds are certainly described in the Chronicle. This, in itself, does not furnish conclusive proof that Leo was the author of the Narratio, although there is certainly a strong suggestion that the two authors were one and the same; but Peregrini (and following him Migne) considers that the case is finally proved by the concluding words of the Narratio:

Quorum omnium nomina cum reliquarum ecclesiarum pignoribus pariter suis in loco Domino, juvante scribemus.

- the concluding words of Leo's contribution to the Chronicle²⁰³.

Recent research on the authors of the Chronicle has raised the question of whether or not Leo was the author of this chapter; but the latest editor of the Chronicle assigns it definitely to him.

It is this latest editor, Professor Hoffmann, who has commented most recently on the nature and purpose of the Narratio de dedicatione. He evidently accepts the now traditional attribution to Leo and sees the Narratio as a means of dating the composition of the Chronicle itself. The Narratio, he believes, following Peregrini's general line of reasoning, was the precursor of the Chronicle and served as a sort of aide-memoire towards the writing of the section on the dedication of the basilica in 1071²⁰⁴ (and, presumably, if Leo had been able to complete the Chronicle himself, towards the composition of further sections on later dedications). This is a plausible argument, as several other passages in Leo's section of the Chronicle, in addition to those quoted by Peregrini, correspond in whole or in part to passages in the Narratio²⁰⁵. But for Leo, this is out of character: he was a painstaking historian with an eye for style as well as for content and he did not usually rehash his work in this manner. And other circumstances militate more strongly against Hoffmann's classification of the Narratio as a preliminary draft or aide-memoire to be used in the final section of Leo's work: there is considerably more information - and information of a significant nature - in the Chronicle than in the Narratio, its supposed source, and there are significant discrepancies between the two.

Whereas the Narratio contains less than two thousand words - and only about a third of these deal with the 1071 consecration - the account of this event in the Chronicle stretches to between five and six thousand words and contains a wealth of detail concerning Desiderius's use of artisans from Constantinople and the proportions and magnificence of the new basilica²⁰⁶. And the section immediately following the list of dignitaries contains, in the Chronicle, a list of altars and relics which is not to be found in the Narratio²⁰⁷. Insofar as the dedication of the great basilica is concerned, the author of the Narratio is interested only in the circumstances leading to the rebuilding of the church, the pope's invitation to 'archdeacon Hildebrand and the remainder of the Roman bishops and cardinals' and with the list of those who actually attended the dedication²⁰⁸.

And it is in this list that the greatest obstacles to considering the Narratio as a precursor of the Chronicle lie.

The list of those present at the dedication contains, in the Chronicle version, ten archbishops and forty-four bishops:

Archbishops

Salerno
Capua
Naples
Sorrento
Siponto
Trani
Amalfi
Acerenza
Otranto
Oria

Bishops

Portus
Tusculum
Savino
Segni
Anagni
Veroli
Terracina
Gaeta
Aquino
Sorano
Marsicum
Balvi
Penne
Teano
Caleno
Rossellano
Aversa
Nola
Avellino
Pesto
Troia
Florentinum
Melfi
Lucerino
Dragonaria
Civitate
Termuli
Guardia
Larino
Ariano
Isernia
Bovino
Salpi
Canne
Ruvo

Venuso
Minerbino
Vigilio
Molfetta
Juvenazo
Monopoli
Ostuni
Taranto
Perugia

and the bishop-elect of Castellano, who was consecrated on the day following the ceremony of the dedication²⁰⁹.

In the Narratio version, there are three cardinals, seven archbishops and only thirty-six bishops, and the list of participants differs considerably:

Cardinals

Portus
Tusculum
Sabinum

Archbishops

Salerno
Capua
Naples
Sorrento
Siponto
Trani
Taranto

Bishops

Segni
Anagni
Veroli
Terracina
Gaeta
Marsico
Sorano
Aquino
Teano
Caleno
Venaфра
Aversa
Picaeno
Pesto
Boiano
Civitate
Dragonaria
Troia
Melfi
Canne
Florentinum
Termuli
Larino
Guardia
Vigilo

Minervino
 Ruvo
 Ostuni
 Monopoli
 Juvenazo
 Ariano
 Acerenza
 Venusino
 Otranto
 Perguia
 and the bishop-elect of Castellano²¹⁰

While the majority of the names of dioceses remain the same in both accounts, the Chronicle adds the dioceses of Balvi, Penne, Rossellano, Nola, Avellino, Lucerino, Molfetta, Isernia, and Salpi. And, to increase the confusion further, the lists of archbishops do not agree. Both texts give as participants the archbishops of Salerno, Capua, Naples, Sorrento, Siponto, and Trani, but the Narratio adds the cardinals of Portus, Tusculum, Savino, and the archbishop of Taranto, whereas the Chronicle adds Amalfi, Acerenza, Otranto, and Oria, one of which, Acerenza, is mentioned only as a bishopric in the Narratio. In similar fashion, the Chronicle account demotes the archbishops of Portus, Tusculum, Savino and Anagni to the status of bishop²¹¹.

If anything at all is clear from this muddled state of affairs, it is the extreme unlikelihood, given the considerable areas of disagreement between the two documents, that the Narratio could ever have served as a source for the Chronicle. Despite the similarities between the two texts, the dissimilarities are so great as to seriously question the hitherto-accepted view of their relationship: and the final nail in the coffin of this older theory is provided by a consideration of the personal names of bishops and archbishops given in the Narratio. Every ecclesiastical dignitary present is identified by his Christian name - and this of course, is where we find the names of Campo of Dragonaria and Robert of Florentinum - but these Christian names are not given in the Chronicle. It is unlikely that a meticulous writer such as Leo would have omitted to include the names, had he had them at his disposal²¹².

If the Narratio is not a source for the Chronicle, what is it and why was it written? The answer to these questions lies in yet another document, a forged bull of Alexander II in which the discovery

of relics of Benedict, Karlomann, Constantinus, and Simplicius is referred to²¹³. This 'wonder' had already been described in an account by Peter the Deacon, the continuator of the Monte Cassino Chronicle as well as by Leo himself. According to Peter, the relics were suddenly discovered on the octave of the feast of St Benedict, with the accompanying apparitions of an earth tremor and a great odour of sweetness, the classic odour of sanctity; and the account of this which Peter inserted in his Homily on the octave of St Benedict is partly reproduced in the forged bull²¹⁴. The other element which went into the composition of the forgery is a genuine bull of Alexander II, which Peter had earlier entered in his own Registrum²¹⁵. The forgery (which is not in the Registrum and therefore post-dates the early 1130s) is written in alternating Beneventan and miniscule script: and despite its obviously unusual appearance, the historian Gregorovius confessed to a feeling of reverence at the sight of

the great parchment document.....to which, on the day of the consecration, Alexander II, Peter Damian, Hildebrand, Desiderius, Richard of Capua, Jordan, Rainulf, Landulf of Benevento, and Gisulf of Salerno, had subscribed their names.....²¹⁶

The other subscriptions consist of those of the archbishops and bishops named in the Narratio, plus those of Otto of Ostia, and six cardinal-bishops ('of unknown origin', as Caspar says in a slightly different context)²¹⁷

It has been assumed until now that Peter gleaned the names of the majority of his 'participants' from the Narratio, which was believed to be a genuine and earlier source, and the work of Leo; but the evidence presented here indicates a much closer chronological relationship between the two, which may well have been the work of one author. It is not going too far, I think, to assume that the Narratio probably post-dates the 1140s, when both Campo and Robert were alive: the evidence of all the sources presented above indicates strongly the genuineness of the document from St Leonardo, Siponto, as it alone has no indications against its reliability, and it seems only logical to regard it as a source - however indirect - for the forgeries from St Maria di Tremiti and Monte Cassino. We shall return to this question presently: but if we accept this reasoning for the moment, then the possibility of Peter's involvement in the composition

of the Narratio is increased, as he only died at some time after 1159, and although he was known to be active for at least part of the twenty years preceding this date, the subject of his activities has not yet been entirely uncovered²¹⁸. The composition of the 'bull' of Alexander II and possible involvement in the composition of the Narratio seem fitting subjects for Peter's declining years. He was probably the greatest of monastic forgers of the middle ages, and he would not have scrupled to have composed works such as these to bolster up the now-declining fortunes of Monte Cassino: the 'Cassinense wonder' and the former importance of the house could easily be impressed upon the world.

And another circumstance points to Peter as the author of the Narratio. In his Rerum Italicarum Scriptores the great Italian historian Muratori identified it as Peter's work by the words Quorum omnium nomina cum reliquarum ecclesiarum pignoribus pariter suis in locis, domino iuvente scribemus with which it concludes, and which also appear in Book Four of the Chronicle which was composed by Peter²¹⁹. These words, of course, also appear in Book Three, as they were originally Leo's²²⁰; and it is on this basis that other historians have declared that Muratori is mistaken and that the Narratio should be attributed to Leo. But if Peter borrowed for his own section of the Chronicle, he might equally well have done so in order to construct the Narratio: and it has passed unremarked by historians that there are at least two other borrowings from Leo's part of the Chronicle, which appear not only in Book Four, composed by Peter, but also in the Narratio²²¹. And whereas, as we have already observed, it was not Leo's habit to repeat himself as he gave much attention to style and was also a constant reviser of his own work, Peter was an inveterate borrower and copier and was quite capable of using Leo's material not once but twice. It is, of course, possible that the Narratio was the work of a third party who utilised both Peter's and Leo's writings: but the balance of probability suggests, at the moment, that Peter was involved in, and probably the author of the Narratio.

What are the implications of all this for the Liber Praeceptorum and the synodal document of Milo of Benevento? The Liber Praeceptorum has long been viewed with doubt - partly, it should be

admitted, because of the strange edition produced by Ughelli, but also because of the number of forgeries contained in section six. That the case of St Maria in Olicino and St Benedict in Dragonaria and the dispute between the abbot of St Sofia and the bishops of Dragonaria is questionable can be gleaned from a careful reading of section six itself: the documents supposedly issued by Milo in 1075 and Udalric in 1061 are followed, at a much later point in the manuscript, by another settlement of the quarrel, again by archbishop Udalric, but this time supposedly in 1062²²². The list of participants at the synod also differs considerably from that of the 1061 document: in place of Dodo of Rossellano, papal chancellor, Bernard, 'fellow-bishop', and the bishops of Civitate, Florentinum, Larino, Montecorvino, Bovino, Telese, Alife, Bibino, and Frequentino, we find Dodo again, along with Amelgerius of Civitate, Landolf of Florentinum, John of Larino and 'other bishops'; and those subscribing to the document unaccountably consist of Bernardus 'episcopus', Constantinus, also bishop, and three cardinals, John, Lambert, and Aegidius, none of whom figure in the synodal proceedings themselves. Moreover, the identity of the three cardinals gives rise to doubt as they are not otherwise known²²³. Even on the basis of internal evidence alone, the dossier on the dispute over the two churches appears vague and contradictory.

External evidence too - in addition to the all-important clues provided by the 'original' from St Leonardo - points firmly to the unreliability of the one document supposedly issued by archbishop Milo. The diplomatic of the piece - and that of the two other items dealing with the St Sophia-Dragonaria dispute is virtually identical to that of a synodal document of Nicholas II of 1061 which is itself suspect; and the same style, interestingly enough, surfaces in a synodal document of 1059 from St Maria di Tremiti. (The subject of this is a papal recognition of St Maria's independence from Monte Cassino - and if the document is genuine, St Maria had a long and hard struggle ahead of it before it could shake off the Cassinese claims to domination)²²⁴. And the character of the hands in which Vat Lat 4939 is written point to a date rather later than 1119, the supposed year of its composition. Its appearance suggests that it may actually date to the second half of the twelfth century (and it was so described in a recent Vatican exhibition)²²⁵.

All this, of course, implies some level of contact or even cooperation between writers of cartularies: while we perhaps imagine such a writer jealously guarding the rights of his house by hugging his knowledge to himself, the contents of the documents reveal a different reality. Advances and changes in diplomatic could only spread by contact; and while to the modern eye forgers were often unsophisticated in their attempts to concoct documents, transposing names and leaving inconsistent dates, the whole process must have been facilitated by the movement of trained scribes between various centres of production. Lowe detects a Cassinese-trained hand at work in Vat Lat 4939²²⁶: if he is correct, and there seems to be no reason to doubt him here, we are dealing with an obvious point of contact and opportunity for transmission of information between Monte Cassino and St Sophia - or vice versa.

The individual circumstances of the four houses in question also have a strong bearing on this problem of communication and co-operation. Only St Leonardo, the newest of the monasteries, founded in either the late eleventh or the early twelfth century appears to have enjoyed a rising degree of prosperity in the twelfth century²²⁷; and it seems only logical that three houses no longer at the zenith of their fortunes should obtain information - probably covertly - from a newer and rising star in order to prop up their own declining power. Moreover, Monte Cassino's attempts to exert its influence over St Sofia and St Maria had finally petered out; St Sofia's freedom was finally acknowledged by the second decade of the twelfth century and St Maria's by 1153-4 at the latest²²⁸. So, by the 1150s, there was less need than ever for secrecy where the affairs and possessions of these houses were concerned (if, indeed, that had ever been practicable in the first place). By the 1150s, the position of the three houses was similar in one important respect: they were all, whatever their original status, undergoing a decline.

Monte Cassino, the most famous and powerful of Benedictine monasteries in southern Italy in the eleventh century was the first to suffer. It was formerly held by many historians that this decline was the product of an unholy trinity, of wealth, power, and involvement in worldly arrairs; but the arrest of its abbot, Oderisius, by

Honorius II in 1125 was the product of an old personal antagonism and, more importantly, of a shift in the papacy's southern Italian policy²²⁹. Whereas Gregory VII had cultivated the dangerous alliance with the Normans, the popes of the so-called 'new' reform, such as Honorius and Innocent II, moved away from this method of operation, with its dependence on great houses such as Monte Cassino, with the result that the latter was driven into the arms of Anacletus II in the schism of the 1130s²³⁰. Peter the Deacon, aware of the abbey's past glories, was ready to defend his house with the means at his disposal: if we are to believe his self-glorifying and unreliable Altercatio pro cenobio Casinensis, he spoke energetically and at considerable length before the emperor and Innocent II when Monte Cassino was called to account for its role in the schism²³¹; and many of his forgeries, as we have already observed, are designed to bolster the power of the monastery.

St Sofia had also committed the indiscretion of supporting the losing side in the schism of the 1130s, and it is probably symptomatic of a consequent decline that there appear to be no papal privileges for the house between 1135-7 and 1167. It appears to move into a sort of limbo during this period: there are comparatively few documents of any kind from St Sofia, and, in contrast to the favourable treatment meted out to it by Anacletus, we find that, in 1152 Eugenius III ordered the abbot to give up lands belonging to the monastery of St John in Venosa (and the case was still in dispute under Innocent III)²³². The house was finally taken under papal protection by Clement III in 1189²³³. The 1150s indeed appear to find St Sofia at the nadir of its fortune, and it is at just such a point that a decision may have been taken, perhaps unofficially, to attempt to remedy the situation by any means available. Association with Anacletus may have rendered it necessary for the monastery to produce a cartulary free from taint and therefore dated to 1119: certainly, the privileges given by the antipope were only copied in later. (The fact that these are not in the original hand might be seen as evidence that the writer was indeed working in 1119, but internal evidence suggests that these were copied in before two of Calixtus II (1119-24) Additions were haphazard and sparse - there are

no other entries of other papal documents before the reign of Innocent III, although several were issued for St Sofia, including two definitely preserved in Beneventan archives.)²³⁴

The decline of St Maria di Tremiti seems, from the evidence of the documents left to us, to have been less marked, although it is noticeable that there are more eleventh than twelfth century documents in the cartulary, possibly another indication that a forger was at work²³⁵. There is a noticeable diminution of the monastery's influence in the Gargano area after 1155, and the latest editor of the cartulary conjectures that this may have been the result of involvement in the revolt against William I of Sicily in 1155-6²³⁶. Although it is true that the abbey enjoyed close links with such participants in the revolt as the counts of Loritello and Lesina, there is no evidence of any closer connection with the actual revolt; but it does seem to be true that this was the beginning of a period of decline which, despite attempts by several abbots to stem the tide, resulted in the eventual takeover by the Cistercians of Casanova in the 1230s²³⁷. The ultimate decline of the monastery in the thirteenth century may, of course, have been the occasion of the falsification of the cartulary; but although there is a much clearer connection between St Leonardo, St Sophia and Monte Cassino in the period following the composition of the original document from St Leonardo, it is quite possible that the Campo- and Robert- documents in the Tremiti cartulary also date from around the 1150s.

Although the evidence surrounding its composition is by no means as plentiful as we could wish, it is clear that the document which purports to be the product of a synod held by Milo of Benevento is a forgery. Even the existence of an 'original' does nothing to diminish this impression: it is in a hand of the second half of the twelfth century, and its appearance, with a large 'tail' slit to hold a seal, is quite unlike that of other genuine documents from St Sophia - or from other southern Italian monasteries at this period²³⁸. While much has been written on the subject of cartularies in general, and while some historians have tackled the rather trickier question of forgeries and 'semi-' or 'quasi-originals' surprisingly little comment is sometimes passed on the rationale behind such compositions: Capasso, for instance, refers to the Liber Praeceptorum, with its notorious section six, as the 'mischievous work' of an unknown

twelfth-century monk²³⁹. It is true that the methods of our monastic forgers, lacking what the modern eye would consider to be sophistication, combine to inculcate a sort of disbelief that there was any real purpose behind their composition. However, as the work of individual forgers such as Peter the Deacon becomes better-known, it becomes increasingly possible to discern some purpose behind these seemingly pointless works. Peter and his role in combating the decline of Monte Cassino in the twelfth century are now well known; and it is clear that in the cases of both St Maria di Tremiti and St Sophia in Benevento we are dealing with parallel situations whereby the anonymous authors of the cartularies were seeking to improve the position of their houses.

How far can Becquet's claims that the career of Milo of Benevento sheds precious light on that of Stephen of Muret be justified? His most important pieces of evidence for Milo's Italian years only serve to confuse the issue considerably: for in addition to the circumstance that the 'synodal document' of 1075 is a forgery, and related to other forgeries, the two other references to Milo are closely linked to it. The entry for Milo in the annals of Vat Lat 4939 is in a hand considered to be the same as that which 'copied' the forgery itself; while in the Vat Lat 4923 annals which are, it must be stressed, also a product of the scriptorium of St Sofia in Benevento, the entries recording the accession and death of Archbishop Milo are situated at the end of the entries for 1074 and 1075 respectively, whereas the accession and death of other archbishops are placed at the beginning of the entries²⁴⁰. Was Milo an afterthought on the part of the writer? Certainly, the evidence which is treated by Becquet as the main part of his case for Milo cannot be accorded the trust which he, somewhat short-sightedly, puts in it. Is Milo, therefore, known to us from any other sources?

The obvious writings to which to turn are those of local Beneventan historians, whom one would expect to display some interest in their archbishop: but even here, information is disappointingly scarce. As Becquet himself found, when corresponding with the director of the provincial archives in Benevento (situated, interestingly, in the monastery of St Sophia itself) not one modern historian of the area has investigated Milo, and the situation has not changed since

the 1950s²⁴¹. The greatest interest in Beneventan ecclesiastical affairs appears to have occurred in the seventeenth century, when the ecclesiastical rivalry between Benevento, Salerno, and Naples was at its height. Pompeo Sarnelli, writing in 1691, simply states that Milo was the benefactor of Stephen of Muret, the founder of the order of Grandmont, and became archbishop either at the end of 1074 or the beginning of 1075; and he also quotes from the synodal document of April 1075²⁴². Di Vipera, the author of the catalogue of the saints of the Beneventan church seems to be our only other local authority on the subject. He refers to Milo in a second work, a list of Beneventan bishops and archbishops: the information contained in the two books is essentially the same and is best considered at the same time. He believes that Milo became archbishop in 1063 'or thereabouts', and mentions Milo's connection with Stephen. It is instructive to note the sources of his information: the Topographia Sanctorum of Martin, bishop of Cabula; the Topographia of Ferrari; David Romeo's Catalogus Sanctorum Regni; and the World-Chronicle of Hartmann Schedel - all of them compilations of one kind or another, and none of them of local origin²⁴³. His only local source of information for Milo is drawn, he claims, from a necrology of the convent of St Peter: it refers to his death on February 23rd and calls him 'sanctus archiepiscopus noster'²⁴⁴. In view of the fact that, as di Vipera himself states, there was no cult of St Milo in Benevento, this information may be regarded as doubtful at best. The question is not helped by the circumstance that there were two convents dedicated to St Peter in the area of Benevento, one in the archiepiscopal palace, and one just outside the walls. While it seems logical to suppose that di Vipera is referring to the former, we cannot be absolutely certain on the subject; and in any case the surviving manuscripts from both these houses have so far failed to yield the reference which di Vipera gives²⁴⁵. We have, therefore, no way of determining the antiquity or genuineness of the statement although di Vipera says that the entry is in 'lombard characters', the Beneventan script was in use into the thirteenth century. Moreover, di Vipera is a biased witness and it is quite possible that he is either in error or deliberately misleading his reader²⁴⁶. It is, of course possible that the manuscript has simply fallen victim to the usual hazards of loss, destruction, or even misclassification; but the fact remains that, at the moment, it cannot be traced.

Moreover, the reliability of local historians such as di Vipera and Sarnelli is called into question - all accusations of bias aside - by the obvious errors and imprecisions to which they are liable, especially over matters of dating. Di Vipera places Milo in the 1060s, when archbishop Udalric - whose existence is well-attested - was still alive (he died in 1068)²⁴⁷; and both he and Sarnelli interpose into the succession of bishops at this time one Aurelius for whom there is no eleventh-century evidence (nor do they attempt to present any). A Vatican manuscript gives Milo as 'Albericus Milo', perhaps a conflation and misspelling of the two names. It is difficult, in view of all this, to regard even local historians as reliable witnesses²⁴⁸.

The extremely shadowy figure of archbishop Aurelius leads us on to another problem of which Becquet is, to his credit, at least partly aware. This is the problem of the vacancy in the Beneventan archbishopric between the death of Udalric in 1068 and the accession of Milo in 1074. Why should an important city such as Benevento remain without an archbishop for so long? It became a papal city in 1054, although the Lombard princes appear to have been involved in its affairs up to August 1073, when Landulf handed over the government of the city to Gregory VII, probably as a result of the presence of the Normans in the area and because his own personal government had been considerably weakened. (Pandulf died at the battle of Montesarchio in 1074 and Landulf in 1077)²⁴⁹. Gregory spent only one month in Benevento, August 1073, in which he concluded the treaty by which he took over the government of the city; his next, and last, visit was of equally short duration and occurred in 1033²⁵⁰. Neither Gregory nor his predecessor Alexander II appear to have made any provision for filling the see of Benevento between the death in 1068 of Udalric and the accession in 1074 of Milo. None of this, however, can explain the long archiepiscopal vacancy in this important centre; and the question seems destined to remain unsolved unless new evidence emerges. Perhaps the vacancy was caused by the growing weakness of the rule of the Lombard princes, which had been threatened ever since the 1050s: the opposing party in the city favoured the papacy and it is possible that the two sides had reached an impasse over who should appoint or be appointed to this important position²⁵¹. The presence

of the Normans in southern Italy may also have helped to exacerbate the situation, as neither party would wish to appoint a man who might in any way be influenced by them. But in the absence of any concrete evidence on the subject, this must all remain conjecture.

Nevertheless, it is equally evident that Becquet's remarks on Gregory's supposed appointment of Milo are also conjecture. Of the two annals which mention Milo, only that of Vat Lat 4928 mentions Gregory's visit to Benevento in 1073, which it ascribes incorrectly to 1074; and even so it does not link this visit with Milo's accession:

.....electus est domnus Madelmus et consecratus in abbatia
a domno papa Gregorio. et Milo fit archiepiscopus.²⁵²

Milo is, as we have already observed, an afterthought. The annals of Vat Lat 4939 do not even mention Gregory's visit to Benevento, although Madelmus's consecration and Milo's accession are both referred to²⁵³. The obvious source to which to turn for relations between Gregory and Milo is Gregory's correspondence; and here, just as in the case of the foundation at St Florent-sous-Dol, there is nothing to suggest any relationship whatsoever between them. Gregory neither writes to Milo nor about him. Once more, Becquet's extravagant claims for evidence which is basically extremely scanty can be seen to be mistaken: Whatever the truth about Milo he was not - if he existed - a papal nominee and a pillar of the reform movement.

Indeed, the closer one approaches the evidence for Milo, the more tenuous a figure he becomes. Perhaps this is a condemnation of the essentially constructionist premises on which this survey of his career - and Becquet's claims for him - is based; nevertheless, the historian is duty bound to examine the evidence available, and if the character or thesis under scrutiny crumbles at first touch, then the essential weaknesses may lie in this quarter rather than in the methods used. At the moment, we are left with an archbishop of Benevento about whom we only know that he ruled from 1074 to 1075; and this may be an appropriate point at which to observe that if these were indeed the years of his rule, and the date of his death was February 23rd, as di Vipera claims, then the date of April 1st 1075 on the synodal document allegedly issued by him is totally preposterous. But as the document stands condemned on other grounds and as

the evidence of di Vipera tends to be either unreliable or unverifiable, perhaps the most significant feature of the dating is the circumstance of its referring to April 1st, the traditional All Fools Day! And apart from this faintly ridiculous forgery and two dates which come from related sources, concerning the Italian career of Milo of Benevento there is only silence. The possibilities are, as Becquet seems to have comprehended, infinite: Gregory may just have decided to put an end to the long episcopal vacancy by appointing Milo to the archdiocese. On the other hand Milo may simply be a fiction.

Our knowledge of the occupants of southern Italian dioceses and archdioceses is not always as thorough as we might wish: the traditional method of verifying the accuracy of documents has begun with the examination of the lists of signatories or participants and a name misplaced by a forger may well indicate either reworking or complete fabrication. The names - as the cases of Campo and Robert demonstrate - may be drawn from another, more reliable source and arbitrarily transplanted. That there was a two-way flow of information between Monte Cassino and St Sofia, Benevento, is suggested not only by the character of the hand and miniatures in part of Vat Lat 4939 and by the strange coincidence of names in the synodal document of 1075 with some of those in the Narratio de consecratione, but also by the correspondence of some of the headings in the canonical collection in Vat Lat 4939 to those of Codex Casinensis 522²⁵⁴. Given all this, it is an interesting coincidence that, in the final section of the Monte Cassino Chronicle composed by Leo and immediately before his account of the dedication of the new basilica, he mentions the appointment of a Capuan monk to the bishopric of Sessa Aurunca in 1071: the name of the monk is given as Milo²⁵⁵. And the signature of Milo of Benevento in the 'original' of the document in the Liber Praeceptorum is a broad ordinary miniscule - not unlike that of Peter the Deacon himself²⁵⁶.

Here we are entering into highly speculative areas - although it should be stressed that a comparison of the two signatures of Milo of Paris and Milo of Benevento demolishes once and for all the contention that they were the same person²⁵⁷! Nevertheless, the essential point which must emerge is that any attempt to verify the story of the youth of Stephen of Muret as given in his Life by reference

to Milo of Benevento must be abandoned, because of the confusions and contradictions which surround Milo's career and even his existence. In spite of the efforts of numerous historians, we are left once more with the problem of an unsatisfactory Life and the question-mark which still hangs over Stephen of Muret's spiritual background and orientation.

Notes Part II

1. Vincent of Beauvais, Speculum Historiale (Venice, 1591), I, 25 chapters 46-50 gives a second-hand version of the Life given in the Speculum Grandimontis. For this manuscript, see Louis Guibert, Manuscripts du Seminaire de Limoges no 68 and J. Becquet, 'Les premiers écrivains de l' Ordre de Grandmont' RM XLIII (1953) pp 121-37.
2. Antoninus of Florence, Chronicorum Opus pp 557-9.
Charles Frémon, La vie et les enseignements de Saint Etienne, fondateur de l'ordre de Grandmont (Dijon, 1647).
3. Becquet, 'Les premiers écrivains' p 125, n 8.
4. J. Levesque, Annales Ordinis Grandimontensis (Trier, 1662) p 26;
Pardoux de la Garde, Antiquitez de Grandmont (1654).
5. Levesque, Annales, p 33.
6. The Life of St Gaucher of Aureil is contained in the same MS as the oldest known version of the Life of Stephen (Paris, BN lat 10. 891 ff 71r - 88v). Levesque's acquaintance with it was probably made through the medium of Frémon's work as Frémon seems to have known this MS.
7. Levesque, Annales, pp 29-31.
8. (?) Henri de la Marche de Parnac, Lettre critique d'un religieux de Grandmont a un de ses confrères sur le livre intitulé Les Moines Empruntez (Paris, 1697); id, La vie de Saint Etienne, Fondateur de l' Ordre de Grandmont (2 vols, Paris, 1704 and 1712).
9. *ibid*, p 4.
10. *ibid*, p 64.
11. AASS, February II, pp 199-213. The Life given here is taken from Chifflet who took it, in turn, from Labbé, Bibliotheca Nova MSS II, pp 671-83.
12. *ibid*, pp 202-3.

13. *ibid* pp 210-3.
14. *ibid* pp 201-2.
15. *ibid* pp 202-4.
16. *ibid* pp 204.
17. *ibid* pp 199-201.
18. The date of 1076 for Stephen's settling at Muret is given in the Life as are the other figures. See Life, Scriptores 3 chapters XII, XXXII, XXXIII.
19. AASS February II, p 206, notes.
20. AASS February III, pp 411-12.
21. None of these 'authorities' are, in fact, Beneventan: all are general works consulted by Bolland.
22. Mario di Vipera (Marius de Vipera is the Latinised version of the author's name actually given on the title page and in some catalogues) Catalogus Sanctorum Beneventarum (Naples, 1635) and Chronologia Episcoporum Beneventarum (Naples, 1638) p 91.
23. The year of Milo's death is given as 1070 by G. V. Ciarlanti, Memorie Istoriche del Sannio (Isernia, 1644) Book 3 c 34.
24. As Bolland himself says (p 411), information on Milo's deeds comes only from the Life of Stephen and apart from the chronological indications of the sort given here, he can add nothing further.
25. Martène and Durand, VSAC, vol VI, preface pp viii- xii.
26. *ibid* cols 123-48.
27. AASSOSB vol 9 (1734), sixth century: for the genesis of this work, see Hay, Annalists and Historians (London, 1977) p 161.
28. *ibid* preface, p xxxv-vi.
29. *ibid*.

30. *ibid* p xxxvi.

31. Annales OSB vol 5 p 62.

32. *ibid*.

33. *ibid*.

34. *ibid*.

35. *ibid* p 63.

36. See Maurice Lecomte, 'La publication des "Annales Ordinis Sancti Benedicti"', Mélanges et documents publiés a l' occasion du 2 centenaire de la mort de Mabillon (Archives de la France Monastique, Paris, 1908) pp 253-78. Massuet completed volume 5 from the notes and documents left by Mabillon.

37. See note 25.

38. *ibid* cols 1043-6.

39. *ibid* preface pp viii-xii.

40. *ibid* pp viii - ix.

41. *ibid*.

42. *ibid* p x.

43. *ibid*.

44. *ibid* p x.

45. *ibid* p xi - xii.

46. *ibid* p xii.

47. See, for example, L. Guibert, Destruction de l' ordre de Grandmont (Limoges, 1877); id, 'L' école monastique d' orfèvrerie de Grandmont', BSAHL XXXVI (1889) pp 51-98; A. Lecler, 'Histoire de l' Ordre de Grandmont', BSAHL LVII (1907) pp 129-71.

48. See Fliche and Martin, Histoire de l' Eglise, vols 8 and 9 (Paris,

1946 and 1953). Vol 8, p 446 note 3 remarks that

.....la vie d' Etienne de Muret, rédigé par le prieur Gerard Ithier ...a été écrite pour obtenir la canonisation d' Etienne et elle est plus fertile en faits édifiantes qu' en renseignements précis.

This is the view of Fliche himself. In vol 9 (p 241), Rousset de Pina also asserts that the composition was designed to obtain canonisation and he lays stress on the way in which the incident of the cardinals' visit to Stephen is presented (chapter 32 of Becquet's edition) - it lends an air of a previous sanction or approval which did not really exist.

49. Becquet, 'Les premiers écrivains' p 124.

50. *ibid.*

51. *ibid* p 126.

52. *ibid.*

53. *ibid* p 127.

54. *ibid* p 126.

55. *ibid* pp 126-7.

56. *ibid* p 127; p 130; p 129.

57. *ibid* p 129.

58. *ibid* p 134.

59. 'Saint Etienne de Muret et l' Archevêque de Bénévent Milon' BSAHL LXXXVI (1957) pp 403-9.

60. *ibid* p 403 and see note 48 above.

61. *ibid.*

62. *ibid.*

63. *ibid.*

64. *ibid.*

65. *ibid* pp 403-4; see the Life (Scriptores 3) chapter XXXII; and for the presence of the papal legates in France, see T. Schieffer, Die Päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich (Berlin, 1935) pp 214-7.
66. Becquet, 'Saint Etienne' p 404.
67. *ibid*.
68. *ibid*.
69. *ibid*.
70. *ibid* note 6. In fact, the document in IS 8 (1721) pp 88-90 is dated 1075.
71. This is an edition of the Annales Beneventani by Pertz in the MGH SS III (Hanover, 1839). Becquet is apparently unaware of the comparatively recent edition by Ottorino Bertolini, BISIMEAM 42 (1923) pp 101 ff. Pertz's edition is based upon a highly imaginative version given by Pratili and is not to be trusted.
72. Becquet, 'Saint Etienne' pp 404-5, note 6.
73. *ibid*.
74. *ibid* p 404.
75. *ibid* p 406.
76. *ibid* note 10.
77. *ibid* p 406.
78. *ibid*.
79. *ibid*.
80. *ibid* pp 406-7.
81. *ibid* p 407.
82. *ibid*.
83. *ibid* p 408.

84. *ibid* pp 408-9.
85. *ibid*.
86. Scriptores Ordinis Grandimontensis, Corpus Christianorum (Continuatio Medievalis VIII) (Turnhout, 1968). The works collected date from the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries; and much of the material derives from, or is associated with the Speculum Grandimontis. For the selection of his articles indicated by Becquet, see note 1 to Part I of this thesis.
87. Scriptores 3, Introduction p 102, where he cites the Cambridge MS first in the list of those which he has used in compiling the Life. The Cambridge version of the Life is followed, in the manuscript, by the Institutio or customs of the Order of Grandmont, written in a similar hand of the early thirteenth century. See Becquet, Scriptores, p 514.
88. See the Book of Saints compiled by the Benedictines of St Augustine's, Ramsgate (5th ed, London, 1966) p 507, where Milo is credited with a 'popular cult' and is therefore referred to as 'Blessed' rather than 'saint'. The brief entry makes him a native of the Auvergne who became a canon in Paris and dean of the chapter of Paris and finally Archbishop of Benevento in 1074. 'He died two years later'.
89. See in particular Derek Baker, 'San Bernardo e l' elezione di York', Studi su S Bernardo di Chiaravalle nell' ottavo centenario della canonizzazione (Bibliotheca Cisterciensis 6, Rome, 1975).
90. Lanzoni, Le diocesi d' Italia (Studi e testi 35, Rome, 1960) pp 254 ff for the saints venerated in Benevento.
91. See Scriptores 3 chapters III-IX pp 106-9.
92. See H. Delehaye, Cinq leçons sur la methode hagiographique (Brussels, 1934).
93. AASS February III p 411.
94. See above note 22.

95. See AASS February III p 411 for the earlier works used by the Bollandists; Vipera, Catalogus Sanctorum p 80.
96. The absence of churches dedicated to Milo is attested for the eighteenth century also by the map in Stefano Borgia, Memorie Istoriche della Pontifiche Città di Benevento (Rome, 1764) vol II, frontispiece. Today, the most notable churches in Benevento are - apart from the cathedral - those of St Sofia, the basilica of St Bartholomew, San Filippo, Sant' Agatha, and the Madonna delle Grazie, with the convent churches of San Francesco and San Pasquale (formerly St John of Jerusalem). Also of interest are the ruins of the Byzantine church of Sant' Ilario, apparently a parish church in the twelfth century and today used as part of a rustic home! The church is dealt with by M. Rotili, 'La chiese di S. Ilario a Porta Aurea', Atti del III Congresso di Studi sull' Alto Medioevo (Spoleto, 1959) pp 525 ff. As far as I can determine, the other medieval churches of Benevento were:

the Cathedral - dedicated to the Virgin

S. Andrea (de Platea)
 SS. Filippo e Iacopo
 S. Nicolo (in Turri pagana)
 S. Maria (de Sannutis)
 S. Thomas
 S. Leone IX

while the monasteries were dedicated to

S. Modesto
 S. Deodato
 S. Pietro (intra civitatem)
 S. Pietro (foras muros)
 S. Vittorino
 S. Maria (ad portam summam)
 S. Maria (ad Olivulam)

Just as there is apparently no dedication to Milo here, so there is not any trace of an altar dedicated to, or tomb of, St Milo. The Director of the Provincial Archive, Professore Galasso, who himself has written on medieval Benevento, assures me that he has never found seals bearing the figure of Milo or any evidence of a medieval cult. I am much indebted to Professore Galasso for his help and courtesy.

97. Lanzoni, Le diocesi pp 254-5:

A Benevento nel XVII o nel XVIII secolo, non si volle essere da meno di Napoli, di Capua e di altre città meno illustre della Campania.

See also for further evidence of these aspirations, Giovanni di Vita, Archiepiscopatus Beneventani nec non archiepiscopatum, episcopatum inferiorumque regni Neapoli beneficiorum libertas vindicata (n.p., 1738); Basilio Giannelli, Discorso quale si prova che 'l corpo di S. Bartholomeo apostolo sia in Benevento (Benevento, 1695). For di Vipera's reputation with recent historians see below note 246.

98. See Becquet, 'Saint Etienne' p 406; the document in question is in Paris, Archives Nationales, S 2913 no 25.
99. See M. Prou, Receuil des Actes de Philippe I (Paris, 1907) pp 249-50 and Gallia Christiana VII col 194 for Milo's successor.
100. For charters and acts 1070-80 see Prou, Receuil pp 130-266 and Gallia Christiana VII cols 192 ff for the deans of Paris.
101. Mabillon, Annales OSB V pp 61-2; pp 119-20.
102. A. Lobineau, Histoire de Bretagne vol II, cols 137-8, 'Foundation of the priory of S. Florent-sous-Dol', described as being taken from 'Cartul. abb. S. Florentii', is a cartulary of St Florent of Saumur. Lobineau gives other documents relating to the family of Combour of which John, William, and Gilduin were members, col 145, and Alan Fergent's confirmation (1086) of the foundation of the Dol priory, col 146. Lobineau writes that his material comes from ducal archives, family archives, and those of various religious houses including that of St Florent, Saumur, and can be authentic originals, vidimus, or taken from cartularies (Vol II, preface, p ii). It is interesting, in the light of what follows here, that he simply assigns the document in question to a cartulary of St Florent, as all the cartularies of St Florent - apart from a fifteenth-century copy of some documents from the 'Black' Book - are named and that Lobineau is otherwise careful to assign documents taken from these to a named cartulary - eg the ascription of the confirmation of Alan Fergent to the 'White' Book (col 146). H. Morice, Mémoires pour servir de Preuves a l'Histoire de Bretagne vol I (Paris, 1742) also prints the document with which we are dealing, col 433, and assigns it to the same anonymous cartulary as does Lobineau.

103. BN Nouv. Acq. Lat. 1930 ff 69v - 70r.

104. 'White' Book of St Florent de Saumur, Archives de Maine-et-Loire, H 3713. For this series of documents, see ff 76r - 83v. The 'White' Book dates from the second half of the twelfth century - for a description see the catalogue of the Departmental Archives of Maine-et-Loire, series H, vol 2 p 502.

105. Alan Fergent's confirmation of 1086, 'White' Book f 88 r and v.

106. 'Black' Book (an earlier production than the 'White' cartulary but still of the twelfth century) ff 69v - 70r:

Concessa vero haec sunt. Duae scilicet terrarum mansurae, una in parrochia de Comburno, altera in Lanno Rignano.....Et omnes redditiones quas patri nostro reddebant monachis sancti Florentii reddent. Est etiam ecclesia de Plana Filcaria cum his quae ad eam pertinent, id est decima omnium rerum quas consuetudo in decimari et census de toto burgio cum tota sepultura cymiterii et omnes servientes monachorum illi scilicet qui decimas ab eorum colligent atque hortolani ab omni exactione secularis potestatis erunt liberi.

107. Archives Départementales, Maine-et-Loire Ser. H, 3331 nos VIII - XII.

108. The version given in the 'Black' Book not only differs in details but is considerably longer and gives more personal detail concerning the donors and the (pious) motives for the donation - as one might expect in a document of this type.

109. See P. Marchegaye, 'Chartes Normandes de l' Abbaye de Saint Florent', Mémoires de la Société des Antiquaires de Normandie, 3rd ser., 10 (Caen 1880).

110. Becquet, 'Saint Etienne' p 406.

111. See Lobineau, vol II cols 137-8. Morice prints the document at cols 433-4: this would suggest that he assigned it to the period 1067-70. Henry II's enquete of 1181 is given at cols 682-9.

112. The fifteenth-century copy of extracts - papal and imperial privileges - from the 'Black' Book can be consulted at Paris, BN Nouv.

Acq. Lat. 1931. This and the 'Black' Book itself (BN Nouv. Acq. Lat. 1930) represent the only extensive spread of material from St Florent outside the Maine-et-Loire archives, where the other major cartularies are kept. The Bibliothèque Nationale houses some further copies and extracts from St Florent at MS Nouv. Acq. Francaises 7430; MS Lat 13817; coll. Baluze XL; and coll. Dom Housseau II (Coll. Anjou et Touraine XIII), but none of these holds the document quoted by Lobineau and Morice.

113. See Gallia Christiana XIV cols 1045-6.
114. For Gregory's letters, see also PL 148 cols 458-9 and 470-1.
115. For St Gilduin of Dol see AB I pp 144-7 and AASS January III pp 405-8.
116. A. Murray, 'Pope Gregory VII and his letters', Traditio XXII (1966) pp 149-202, particularly pp 149-68. But see also H. Hoffmann in DA 32 (1976).
117. Murray, pp 168-82.
118. Becquet, 'Saint Etienne', p 407.
119. See Marvin L. Colker, 'Fulcoii Belvacensis Epistolae', Traditio X (1954) pp 191-273, p 191.
120. *ibid* p 194.
121. *ibid* Epistle XIX pp 256-9.
122. *ibid* p 258 l 81.
123. *ibid* 11 84-8.
124. *ibid* p 95; 11 107-8
125. *ibid* 11 111-3; 11 117-8; 1 121; 1 124 - non mala sic fugias, peius ut facias.
126. Colker pp 234-45.
127. *ibid* 1 394 Extinguas faciasque malum quòd peius omittas.

128. For a reinterpretation of the traditional view of Manasses, see J. R. Williams, 'Archbishop Manasses of Rheims and Pope Gregory VII', AHR 54 (1949) pp 804-24.
129. Colker pp 212-4.
130. Williams, p 811.
131. *ibid* p 807.
132. *ibid.* p 816.
133. Colker, pp 212-4, Epistle 2.
134. Andre Wilmart, 'Deux lettres concernant Raoul le Verd, l' ami de saint Bruno', RB 51 (1931) p 264.
135. For the Grandmontine house of La Haye-sur-Angers see Becquet 'La bullaire de Grandmont', RM XLVI pp 54-5 and E. M. Hallam, 'Henry II, Richard I and the Order of Grandmont' Journal of Medieval History, 1 (1975) pp 165-87, esp pp 175-7. The house evidently contained lepers - this goes against the Grandmontine Rule (Scriptores 2 p 88 chapter XLIV).
136. Gallia Christiana vol VII c. 194 no IX. There is no mention of the archdiocese of Benevento in this obituary.
137. See Colker, p 248 Epistle 13 - 'To Odo, Dean of Paris' - who is accused of theft.
138. Becquet, 'Saint Etienne' p 404 and ibid notes 4-6.
139. IS VIII (2nd ed, 1721) p 88.
140. O. Bertolini, 'Gli Annales Beneventani', BISIMEAM 42 (1923) pp 1 - 163. We are only dealing here with two out of the three Annales. The third (Naples, Bib. Naz. cod. VI E 43) covers the years 1096 - 1129-30 and does not mention Archbishop Milo.

Before Bertolini's work, the best-known edition of the Annales of Vat Lat 4928 was that of N. Aloisia, 'Breve Chronicon Monasterii Beneventanae Sanctae Sophiae auctore anonymo, de rebus gestis in ducatu Beneventano, ab anno Christi DCCLXXXVIII usque ad

annum MCXIII, additis notis Cl. viri Nicolae Aloisiae' in Muratori, Antiquitates Italianae medii aevi I (Milan, 1738).

The Annales of Vat Lat 4929 were edited by S. Borgia in Breve Istoria del dominio temporale della Sede Apostolica nelle Due Sicilie (Rome, 1788) pp 24-8 as 'Breve Chronica scritta nell' anno 1119 premessa al celebre Registro del Monastero di Sancta Sophia di Benevento conservato nel codice n 4939' (with some errors and omissions).

See also B. Capasso, Le fonti della storia delle provincie Napoletane dal 568 - 1500 (Naples, 1902); F. Ehre, F. Ehre, Zur Geschichte der Katalogierung der Vaticana HJ XI (1890) pp 718 ff; E. A. Lowe, 'Der Ältesten Kalendarien aus Monte Cassino', Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters III, 3 (1908) and The Beneventan Script (Oxford, 1914); R. Poupardin, Etudes sur l'histoire des Principautés Lombardes de l'Italie Méridionale (Paris, 1907); W. Smidt, Das Chronicon Beneventani Monasterii Sanctae Sophiae (Berlin, 1910).

141. Bertolini pp 18-21.

142. *ibid* pp 17-27.

143. VL 4928 f 6 r; VL 4939 f 13 r.

144. Or three, remembering the existence of the Naples MS. See Bertolini pp 30 - 99 for this extremely complicated question.

145. Bertolini p 31.

146. *ibid*.

147. *ibid* p 18.

148. *ibid* pp 24 - 31.

149. Ughelli IS VIII (2nd ed 1721) cols 88-90; IS X (2nd ed 1722) cols 519-20. In the latter volume it forms part of the Anecdota Ughelliana and is entitled 'Chronicon Beneventani Monasterii Sanctae Sophiae Ordinis SPN Benedicti ab anonymo Benedictino eiusdem monasterii ante DC annos conscriptum nunc primum in lucem editur.

Originale habetur in Bibliotheca Vaticana'. Coleti, the publisher of the second edition, noted - as Pompeo Sarnelli had done in 1691 (Memorie Chronologiche de' vescovi ed arcivescovi della S. Chiesa di Benevento Naples, 1691 pp 53 ff) - that Ughelli's edition was corrupt. The problems caused by this corrupt printed version have tended to dominate consideration of Vat Lat 4939 itself: see Smidt, Das Chronicon Beneventani, passim, especially for its criticism of K. Voigt, Beitrage zur Diplomatik der Langobardischen Fürsten von Benevent, Capua und Salerno (Göttingen, 1902) and Die königlichen Eigenklöster in Langobardenreiche (Gotha, 1909), and R. Poupardin, 'Etude sur la diplomatie des princes lombardes de Bénévent, de Capua, et de Salerne, MAH XXI (1901) pp 115-180. See also Capasso, Le fonti.

Smidt's work is important because it attempts to demonstrate that the objections raised by Poupardin and Voigt to the Liber Praeceptorum are often groundless and it performs the valuable service in this connection, of distinguishing between the exaggerated and often erroneous wording of Ughelli's edition and the more restrained prose of the original. While Ughelli certainly appears to have seen Vat Lat 4939, not only does he give inaccurate and embroidered versions of several documents but he also in section Six, adds documents not in the original cartulary! See Smidt pp 30-40 for this; and it is still something of a mystery whether Ughelli himself is responsible for this bizarre state of affairs. His correspondence, subject to recent scrutiny, may perhaps throw some light on the whole question. In the context of this and later discussion, it should be observed that Ughelli is not always particularly reliable in his series of bishops and archbishops of the southern Italian church perhaps because of the vast scope of his work; a careful scrutiny reveals gaps and inconsistencies.

Smidt's success lies largely in his separation of the original text of the Liber Praeceptorum as given in Vat Lat 4939 from Ughelli's version with its errors and mysterious additions of texts not in the manuscript (for these see IS X cols 525-38 and cols 538-47). However, some doubt must still - or so it seems to me - surround his efforts to demonstrate the genuineness of the original by surveying the corrections made in red ink throughout the Liber which represent changes from 'vulgar' to a more correct

Latin. (For the manuscripts see note 151 below). But this change does not eliminate the possibility of the inclusion of documents which have been tampered with or even of an attempt to write in a deliberately archaizing style and then to correct it to give an air of authenticity to forgeries.

150. See Bertolini pp 24-31, and also see note 151 below.

151. See note 149 above for the question of corrections: I believe that these are made in the same hand as that of the main part of the text itself.

For the illustrations - thirty-six miniatures and numerous decorated initials - see E. A. Lowe, Scriptura Beneventana II (Oxford, 1929). In the text itself, he distinguishes between two main hands (A and B) in the Liber: A writes the main part up to f 153 1 7 and ff 164-206v, while hand B writes 163r and v and from the lower half of f 216 to the end of the MS. Other, later hands write small sections. Hand B, he believes, was trained in the Scriptorium of Monte Cassino; and the larger initials are in the style of Monte Cassino, late eleventh or twelfth century. The pages containing hand B sometimes contain initials of this type, while the initials on the pages written by A are cruder and a more obviously local product.

For my own views on the dating of both Vat Lat 4939 and Vat Lat 4928, see note 225 below.

152. Leo of Ostia, Chronicon Casinensis Book II c 50, PL 173 col 643.

153. See in particular 'Nikephoros I, the Saviour of Greece from the Slavs', Byzantina-Metabyzantina 1 (1946) pp 75-92.

154. See A. Guillou, 'L' Italia Bizantina', BISIMEAM 78 (1967) pp 1-20; A. Guillou and W. Holtmann 'Zwei Katepansurkunden aus Tricarico', Quellen und Forschungen 41 (1961) pp 1-28; F. Trinchera, Syllabus Greearum Membranarum (Naples, 1865) pp 18-20; J. Gay, L'Italie Méridionale et l' Empire Byzantin Depuis l' Avènement de Basile I Jusqu' a la Prise de Bari par les Normandes (867-1071) (Paris, 1904) pp 414-31. I have not been able to consult Jean Marie Martin, Les Chartes de Trois: Edition et Etude Critique des Plus Anciens Documents Conservés a l' Archivio Capitolare I (1024-1264) (Bari, 1976).

155. See Gay, pp 414-31 and pp 345-52.
156. See Trinchera, pp 18-20.
157. Liutprand of Cremona, Legation to Constantinople, ed E. A. Wright, Collected Works (London, 1930) chapter 62. The accuracy of this statement is doubted by Gay (pp 351-2) although the latter is inclined to accept Liutprand's description of the elevation of the see of Otranto to an archbishopric. Gay's point of view is probably correct, based as it is on a comprehension of the immense practical difficulties which must have been faced in the religious sphere in any process of 'byzantinisation' of southern Italy.
158. The case of Dionysios of Taranto (1007-28) is interesting: his name is Greek, but he signs charters in Latin and his cathedral clergy were Latins. For Taranto, see V. von Falkenhausen, 'Taranto in epoca bizantina', SM 3rd ser 9 (1968) pp 135-56.
159. See Gay, pp 545-52; V von Falkenhausen Untersuchungen über die byzantinische Herrschaft in Suditalien vom 9 bis ins 11 Jahrhundert (Wiesbaden, 1967); D. Girgensohn 'Dall' Episcopato Greco all' Episcopato Latino nell' Italia meridionale', La Chiesa Greca in Italia dall VIII al XVI secolo I (Padua, 1973) pp 25-44; A. Guillou 'La Lucanie Byzantine', B 35 (1965) pp 119-49; H-W Klewitz, 'Zur Geschichte der Bistumsorganisation Campaniens und Apuliens in 10 und 11 Jahrhundert' QFIAB XXIV (1923-4) pp 1-61.
160. Gay, p 479 indicates Leo's pilgrimage to Gargano and his holding of councils at Salerno and Siponto. In 1053, Leo confirmed the union of the dioceses of Benevento and Siponto which had been separated by the Byzantine creation of an archbishopric of Siponto. He also deposed two simoniac archbishops one of whom, Gay thinks, was the archbishop of Siponto. Perhaps; but see also Peter Herde, 'Il papato e la chiesa Greca' in La Chiesa Greca in Italia I pp 213-55. ^{later} Alexander II may even genuinely have deposed the bishops of Lucera, Tertiveri, Biccari, and Ascoli Satriano because of allegations of simony and not primarily out of hostility to the Greek church as such. It is not my intention to convey the impression that the papacy was deliberately undertaking an offensive as such

against the Greek church in southern Italy in the period just before 1054, by means of such depositions and by its reforming councils.. While eventually eager to establish Latin bishoprics where this was possible (and this eliminated several areas of Calabria) the papacy's moves in southern Italy in the early 1050's cannot be directly linked with any certainty to the letter sent to John of Trani, the first stage in the evolution of the 'schism' of 1054.

The final quotation comes from Gay pp 551-2.

161. See H-W Klewitz 'Zur Geschichte' passim and IP vol 9 for suffragans of Benevento.
162. IS vol VIII cols 212-8 for Ariano Irpino. Maynard/Meinard is the first bishop listed there, though Ughelli presents evidence for an earlier bishop. He also cites an inscription dated 1070 on a baptismal font as evidence for Maynard.
163. The Narratio de conscrptione et dedicatione ecclesiae casinensis, described as auctore Leone Marsicano can be found in PL 173 cols 997-1002.
164. Codice diplomatico del monastero benedettino di S Maria di Tremiti (1005-1237) ed, in three volumes, by Armando Petrucci (Istituto Storico Italiano: Fonti Per la Storia d'Italia 98, Rome, 1960) pp 246-50; 250-3.
165. IS VIII cols 344-358 for Sant' Agatha. Bernard is given as the third bishop, known in no other documents according to Ughelli. For Boiano see IS VIII cols 241-8. Ughelli knows of two other references to Albert, one from 1080, the other dated to 1095 from the Liber Praeceptorum.
166. Regesto de S Leonardo di Siponto ed F. Camobreco (Istituto Storico Italiano - Istituto Storico Prussiano, Regesta Chartarum Italiae 10, Rome, 1913) p 13.
167. *ibid* pp 18, 61.
168. IP IX pp 262-3.

169. A. Pratesi, 'Note di diplomatica vescovile beneventana', Buletino del Archivio Paleografico Italiano n.s. vol I (1955) pp 19-91, esp pp 40-1. He presents the document as being of 1143-4 and criticises the quality of Camobreco's edition - but he has no doubt that the document is genuine.
170. IS VIII cols 283-4. The note to this second edition is interesting. Ughelli's series of bishops for the twelfth century gives Robert after Giso and the note insists that, as Robert was present at Lateran III in March 1179 and as Giso subscribes to a document of April, Giso must follow Robert. But it concludes of Robert:
ac unum eundemque esse Robertum ac supra
 memoratum ab Ughello ad an. 1075 ex documenti
 Milonis archiepiscopus Beneventi.
 A reign of 104 years does seem excessively high - or does the note indicate some doubts over the document in which Milo features?
171. Petrucci, S Maria II pp 246-52.
172. Petrucci, S Maria I part II pp clviii ff.
173. *ibid* vol II pp 24-50, esp p 247.
174. O. Vehse, 'Benevent also Territorium des Kirchenstaates bis zum Beginn der Avignoniensen Epoche', QFIAB 22 (1930-1) pp 137 ff.
175. *ibid*.
176. Fifteen documents in the Tremite cartulary (spanning the years 1010 - 1075/7) give amongst the apparatus of their dates the

regnal years of the princes of Benevento (Landolf V and Pandolf III; Pandolf III and Landolf VI; Landolf VI and Pandolf IV). These documents in Petrucci's edition of the cartulary are numbered 2, 4, 11, 30, 33, 35, 36, 38, 41, 55, 56, 71, 72, 74, and 83. Of these, only nos 2 and 38 contain fully consistent and agreeing dates, indictions, and regnal years, as Petrucci's own comments make clear.

177. See Petrucci, S Maria I p lxv.
178. *ibid* vol III appendix I pp 367-72, p 369.
179. *ibid* vol II p 251.
180. *ibid* pp 251 and 253.
181. *ibid* p 252.
182. *ibid* vol I pp iv-lvii. See also E. Caspar, Petrus Diaconus und die Monte Cassineser Fälschungen (Berlin, 1909) p 12 and T. Leccisotti 'Le relazione fra Montecassino e Tremiti e i possedimenti cassinese a Foggia e Lucera', Benedictina III (1949) pp 203 ff.
183. Leo of Ostia (or Leo Marsicanus) Monte Cassino Chronicle Bk 3 PL 173 cols 744-5.
184. IP 9 pp 183-4 no 6.
185. Petrucci, S Maria vol III docs 87 and 88 pp 257-60.
186. Caspar, p 14 n 1.
187. *ibid* p 13.
188. Petrucci, S Maria vol III no 87.
189. Although it is presented by Petrucci as a concession of immunity from episcopal interference, it could very well have more general implications than this given the history of the struggle with Monte Cassino:

Decernimus ergo ut nulli liceat idem cenobium temere

pertubare vel eius possessiones auferre, minuere
vel ablata retinere, set quecumque ad idem cenobium
ex antiquo iure pertinere noscuntur, firma tibi
tuisque successoribus et illibata permaneant eorum,
pro quorum substantatione ac gubernatione concessa
sunt, usibus omnimodo profutura.

190. Caspar, p 14 notes 1 and 2.
191. Petrucci, S Maria II no 77.
192. *ibid* no 54.
193. *ibid* no 51. J. Gay 'La monastère de S. Maria di Tremiti d' apres un cartulaire inedit', Mélanges d' archéologie et d' histoire XVII (1897) pp 387 ff suggests that while Robert Guiscard took the side of Monte Cassino, the 'petits seigneurs' were bound to defend St Maria. Perhaps - but this does not affect our comments on the nature of the document in which their names appear.
194. For Roffridus, see the Annales Beneventani, ed Bertolini, p 144 and his accession-date of 1076; IS VIII cols 90-93 and IX 520-1; also Dietrich Lohrmann 'Roffrid von Montecassino oder Erzbischof Roffrid von Benevent?'. OFIAB 47 (1967) pp 630-40 and E. Monaci in Archivio Paleografico Italiano vol XIII fasc 58 (July, 1950).
195. Known as a participant at the Synod of Melfi - see Klewitz, 'Bistumsorganisation' p 47.
196. Vat Lat 4939 ff 166r-168r; 204v-206v. IS X cols 507-9, cols 550-2.
197. PL 173 col 999. For all these bishops and archbishops IS VIII and IP 9 can also be consulted, but Ugheili is not always reliable and my findings do not always agree with those of Kehr, although the latter contains much useful work.
198. Petrucci, S Maria II p 252 note 4.
199. DHGE I col 1436; AASS April I cols 434 ff.
200. The circumstances and geographical position of the dioceses of Montecorvino, Florentinum, and Dragonaria may well have some bearing on the way in which twelfth-century bishops could be transplanted

into the eleventh century with such ease. Montecorvino, Florentinum, and Dragonaria were all situated on the northern border of the Capitanate, today one of the most inaccessible parts of Puglia. The original cities - probably nothing more, in reality, than very small towns (see the works cited under notes 152-5) - have now disappeared. Their sites lie approximately in the centre of the triangle formed between the points of the modern towns and villages of Lucera, Torremaggiore and San Bartolomeo in Galdo: Dragonara on the east bank of the Fortore near Castelnuovo del Daunia; Montecorvino near Volturara; and Florentinum between Lucera and San Paolo di Civitate, approximately on the site of Frederick II's Castel Fiorentino. In the light of the apparent falsification of the identities of their bishops as early as the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, it is perhaps significant that these have disappeared while others of Boioannes' foundations, e.g. Troia and Termoli have survived in one form or another. Even in the later middle-ages the fate of the dioceses was obscurity and finally disappearance: Dragonaria (Dragonara) was suppressed in the sixteenth century when the town itself had disappeared; Montecorvino (not to be confused with the Montecorvino near Salerno, which was never the site of a diocese) in 1433; and Florentinum at the end of the fourteenth century. Evidently, these towns were founded for military and defensive reasons and it was perhaps the lack of any real commercial base which ensured their disintegration; and this may (and this is no more than a tentative suggestion) have contributed to a comparative obscurity even as early as the twelfth century. For anyone wishing to obtain a clearer idea of the situation of the three dioceses, the best guide can be found in the maps to the Rationes Decimarum.

201. M. Inguanez, I necrologi Cassinesi I: Il necrologio del Cod. Cassinese 47 (Fonti per la Storia d' Italia 83, Rome, 1941).

202. PL 173 cols 445-6.

203. *ibid* cols 764 and 1002.

204. H. Hoffmann 'Studien zur Chronik von Montecassino' DA 29 (1973) pp 54 - 162. As far as I know, Professor Hoffmann's projected

edition of the Monte Cassino Chronicle has not yet been published. For his comments on the Narratio - which he does not identify as being in Leo's hand - see pp 136-7. He argues, earlier in the article, that Clm 4623, the original text of the Chronicle, was written between 1087 and 1105 but goes on

Dieser Zeitraum verengert sich, wenn man die Narratio.....berücksichtigt, welche gegenüber die Chronik wie eine vorarbeit wirkt.....

It is notable that Hoffmann also writes here of der Verfasser rather than Leo and does not identify the MS as being in Leo's hand, though he is more qualified than anyone else to attempt such an identification were it possible.

205. Some resemblances can be found between Narratio col 998, Partibus autem and Chronicle III 27 and 28 ; between Narratio col 998, Venerandae memoriae and Chronicle III 29 col 750; Narratio col 1000, Peractis itaque omnibus and Chronicle III 30 col 754. Some passages correspond even more closely: Narratio, Porro cum haec - honorificentissime fecit = Chronicle III, 33 cols 763-4; Narratio, Omnis etiam - Domino iuvente scribemus = Chronicle III, 33 col 764. However, even at this stage, some doubts must arise as to the Narratio's actual function as an aide-memoire as there are considerable resemblances between Narratio col 1001, Eodem etiam anno and Chronicle III col 762, yet the Chronicle lists relics which the Narratio does not.
206. The Chronicle account of the 1071 events stretches in PL 173 from the foot of col 745 to col 761, whereas the Narratio's description only takes up cols 997 - 1002.
207. PL 173 cols 752-3.
208. For the reference to Hildebrand - see also col 750 for the Chronicle version - see col 997.
209. *ibid* cols 781-2.
210. *ibid* col 999.
211. The differing numbers of cardinals, archbishops and bishops and the variations in classification of these between the two documents

suggest that it is highly unlikely that we are dealing here with a bad transcription from one document to the other.

212. Leo does not, admittedly, use Christian names elsewhere in the Chronicle; but I am inclined to believe that, were the Narratio indeed an aide-memoire, he would have done so.

213. See Caspar, pp 108-11: the bull in question is JL†4690.

214. *ibid* pp 100-1.

215. JL 4630.

216. Caspar, pp 111.

217. *ibid* note 4.

218. The date of Peter's death is given by Caspar p 26 as at some time after 1153, as he is the datarius of a document for that year.

More recently, R. H. Rogers, Petrus Diaconus: Ortus et Vitae Iustorum Cenobii Casinensis (Berkely, 1972) p xxvii comments:

For Peter's later years our information is scanty. The latest reference in his Chronicle is to the election of Pope Lucius II in 1144.....On the basis of a majuscule entry for February 26 added in the necrology of Codex Casinensis 47 after that MS was written in 1159, it is possible to assume that Peter's death fell after that year.

219. RISS vol V col 76 - ut hic postremis verbis conjici forte potest auctorem huius narrationis fuisse Petrus Diaconus.

220. See note 205 above.

221. The instances which immediately come to light are:

<u>Narratio</u>	cf. <u>Chronicle</u> - Leo	cf. <u>Chronicle</u> - Peter
col 1001, <u>Porro cum ab hac.....</u>	Pt III c 33 cols 763-4	Pt IV c 8 cols 828-32 (many reminiscences and correspondences)
col 1002 <u>Annis etiam.....</u>	Pt III c 33 col 764	Pt IV c 9 col 832 <u>Eo etiam die</u>

222. According to Ughelli in 1062 (IS X cols 550-2) - but Vat Lat 4939 ff 204v-206r gives 1061.

223. By an accidental elimination of half a sentence of my text, I have unintentionally given the subscribers according to Ughelli. Vat Lat 4939 f 206v gives none! However, this does not affect my conclusion.
224. See Mansi XIX cols 921-2; IP 8 p 251; and compare with the style of Petrucci S Maria II no 64 pp 197-8, a document issued at the Synod of Melfi '.....surrexit Adam venerabilis monasteri abbas.....et reverenter stans coram sancta sinodo'. Or is this simply the style adopted when dealing with disputes voiced at synods? I can find no real guidance on the matter.
225. My copy of the catalogue to this exhibition has, unfortunately, gone missing, so I cannot now give a precise version of its title: it was, however, an exhibition of manuscripts collected by popes for the Vatican.

The dating of codices Vat Lat 4928 and 4939 has been undertaken not only by Bertolini - see notes 141 to 144 above - but also by E. A. Lowe, Scriptura Beneventana (Oxford, 1929) nos LXXXII and LXXXIV. Both Lowe and Bertolini have naturally been much influenced in the case of Vat Lat 4939 by the fact that the writer of the Liber Praeceptorum states that he is writing in 1119 (f. 26v) and also because the principal hand of the Annales terminates in 1119. But neither adduces any further paleographical evidence for their dating beyond Lowe's comment that the hand is of the twelfth century. Given that an expert on the diplomatic of the period finds the Milo-document anachronistic (see note 238 below) and that grave doubts must attach to the presence of Robert of Florentinum and Campo of Dragonaria in its list of witnesses, I would be inclined to place the whole MS in the 1140 s at the earliest: the hand is an angular one which might well, as the description in the Vatican exhibition suggested, date from the second half of the twelfth century.

Nor is it the case that the order of the documents copied in hands other than the main one absolutely confirms the dating of 1119. Section Six is followed by two documents of Calixtus II (ff 209v-212r) and section Five by five privileges of Anacletus II (ff 163r-161v). Lowe asserts that this confirms the date of 1119 for the main hand, as the Calixtan privileges date from 1120 and 1123 respectively. However, they should, by rights, precede the

Anacletan documents at the end of Section Five which deals with the donations made by popes: the present order suggests that the Anacletan privileges (which take up almost all of the space between the main part of Section Five and the beginning of Section Six) were already in place when it was decided to copy those of Calixtus. For further evidence of the haphazard nature of additions, see pp 126-7 and note 234 below. It is also noteworthy that the original fly-leaf of the Liber (now f 215) contains a transcript of the Concordat of Worms 1122, which certainly suggests a date later than 1119!

If, as internal evidence relating to the Milo-document suggests, the Liber was composed later than 1119 (but was intended, for reasons at which we can only guess, to look as if it dated from this period) then this must also apply to the Annales of Vat Lat 4939 with their entries for Milo. Nor can we leave unquestioned the dating of the Vat Lat 4928 Annales because of their relationship with those of Vat Lat 4939, although the exact nature of this relationship remains, despite the efforts of Bertolini, largely undetermined. They shared, apparently, a common source; but they have, interestingly enough, almost nothing in common with Falco of Benevento (see Bertolini pp 40-42) for the short period of their chronological coincidence with him. The hand of Vat Lat 4928 is more calligraphic and regular than that of Vat Lat 4939 and may indeed date from earlier in the twelfth century although this begs the question of why, if this were the case, the writer of the Vat Lat 4929 Annales did not use those of Vat Lat 4928. It seems to me that the two sets of annals are closely related - but that both may have been written later than the years given by both Bertolini and Lowe (who advance evidence that is highly suggestive but not conclusive) - hence the existence of a third series of Annales Beneventani in the form of some marginal notes to chronological tables (see note 141 above). These marginal notes span, with gaps, the years 1096-1130, and the same MS contains a list of popes up to Anacletus II.

Two observations regarding Vat Lat 4939 might be made in this context. The first is that its annals are (within the limitations of their form) a much more ambitious production than those of Vat Lat 4928, beginning as they do before 1 AD (entries for the latter only begin with the foundation of the monastery in 787) and

sometimes giving the regnal years of princes of Benevento and of popes. (See, for example, p 102. The second is that the canonical collection ff 16r-22r is concerned with monastic privileges or donations given to the church, and its true heading may be found on the last page of the annals (f 15r):

Ex legibus Justiniani.
Omnia autem privilegia quae data sunt cenobis
sacrosanctis ecclesiis et religiosis episc.
et clericis sive monachis maneant immutabilia.

For the idiosyncratic position of the entries for Milo in the Annales of Vat Lat 4929, see p 131.

226. E. A. Lowe, Scriptura Beneventana LXXXIV.
227. F. Camobreco, Regesto di S Leonardo di Siponto (Rome, 1913) gives 123 documents between April 1113 and October 1200.
228. See Caspar, pp 16 and 14.
229. See in particular, H. Hoffmann 'Petrus Diaconus, die Herren von Tusculum und die Sturz Oderisius II von Montecassino', DA 27 (1971) pp 1-109.
230. *ibid.*
231. See Caspar pp 248-80 for the text.
232. IP 9 p 95 no * 50.
233. *ibid* p 96 no 54.
234. The two in Beneventan archives are a judgement in favour of St Sophia in its dispute over lands in Apulia with the monastery of St John in Lamis, dated August 1167, Archivio Provinciale fond. S Sofia vol 8 no 9, and the act of 1189 by which Clement III takes St Sophia under his protection, Archivio Provinciale, fond. St Sofia D f 12 F. A privilege of Alexander III was also issued for the monastery in 1180, JL 13690.
235. Petrucci, S. Maria gives 88 documents for the eleventh century and only 36 for the twelfth.
236. *ibid* vol III gives only 13 documents for the period 1155-1200.

See also vol I pp lxi-lxiv.

237. *ibid* p lxii.

238. Pergamene Ald^bgrandini (Vat Lat 13491) I no 23. Parchment, 85x40 centimetres at full length. Franco Bartoloni, 'Note di diplomatico vescovile beneventana', Rendiconti dell' Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei (1950) ser. 8 vol 5 fasc 710 pp 425-47 considers this document to be of dubious authenticity. Roffredus, the deacon-librarian and datarius is still active in 1114; and Bartoloni regards the appearance of a datarius in 1075 as anachronistic, as this figure does not appear before the first two decades of the twelfth century and then again in the 1140 s. (The Milo-document is unique amongst those of the Liber Praeceptorum, Section Six, in employing this usage.)

239. B. Capasso, Le fonti della storia delle provincie Napoletane dal 568-1500 (Naples, 1902) 23.

240. Vat. Lat 4928 f 6r.

241. Becquet, 'Saint Etienne' p 405 n 6. I am indebted to Professore Galasso of the Archivio Provinciale in Benevento for his help and courtesy in dealing with my requests in my search for Milo.

242. P. Sarnelli, Memorie chronologiche de' vescovi ed archievescovi della S. Chiesa di Benevento (Naples, 1691) p 82.

243. For di Vipera, see Part III note 22 above.

244. Di Vipera, Chronologia episcoporum p 90; id, Catalogus sanctorum p 88.

245. These are the monasteries of St Peter Maioris and St Peter intra civitatem. The former has left several documents, one of which is BM Add 5643, but none of which correspond to di Vipera's necrology. The Archivio Provinciale contains some manuscripts from the latter house, but di Vipera's reference still remains untraceable. The Archivio Capitolare also fails to yield any trace of Milo - my thanks to Monsignor Ferrara for his help.

246. Kehr, IP 9 pp 106-7 says of di Vipera (in the context of S Maria ad Olivulam, near Benevento):

Quae Marius de Vipera de hoc monasterio extra civ. Beneventanam sito a subiectione monialium s. Nazarii subtracto iussu Pelagii II (n.†*2) et de translatione reliquiarum ex concessione Gregorii I (n.†*2) huc facta narrat, ex cod. ms de translatione s. Modesti ex Urbe Beneventum in archivio monasterii s. Modesti conservato hausisse asserit (Catalogus p 43, 65; Chronol., p24sq). Neque tamen codex ille superest, neque in aliis codicibus q. D. hagiographici regionis Beneventanae ulla narratio translationis s. Modesti Beneventum adhuc reperta est, ita ut, cum Viperae notitiae erroribus chronologicis abundant, de fide merito dubitandum est.....

247. Di Vipera, Catalogus p 88. This is the date of death given by the Annales of both Vat Lat 4939 and 4928. Udalric is known from documents of the 1050s and 1060s - he was probably made archbishop in 1053 and is supposed to have been of Bavarian origin. See IP 9, Archiepiscopatus Beneventanus, nos 22 - 26.
248. Di Vipera, Chronologia p 90; Sarnelli, p 81. The manuscript in question was written in the seventeenth or eighteenth century - see Vat Reg 350 ff 96 r and v for its list of the Archbishops of Benevento. Di Vipera's reference to Aurelius (he gives it as Bibl. Beneventana, fasc 5 instrumenta 25 no 15) is no more capable of being found than are his references to Milo and seems to me to be particularly incomprehensible, consisting as it does of the words quam et ipse bonusomo in Beneventana civitate tenet a parte Aurelii Archiepiscopi huius sanctae Beneventanae sedis.
249. See Vehse, 'Benevent als Territorium des Kirchenstaates' p 105.
250. *ibid* pp 104-5.
251. *ibid* pp 108-9.
252. Vat Lat 4928 f 6 r.
253. Vat Lat 4939 f 13 r.
254. See Ottorino Bertolini, 'La collezione canonica beneventana del Vat.Lat 4939', Collectanea Vaticana in honorem Anselmi M Card

Albareda (Studi e Testi, 219, Rome, 1962) pp 119-37.

255. Monte Cassino Chronicle II 24, PL 173 col 743.

256. Vat Lat 13491 I no 25. The manuscript is in poor condition, the text illegible in several places where it has been folded. The Milo-signature is very difficult to read and is best seen under ultra-violet light.

257. The signature of Milo of Paris (Archives Nationales S 2913 n. 25) would not reproduce very well in a photograph but I give my own reproductions of both Paris and Beneventan signatures:

(i) Milo of Benevento
(Vatican, Pergamene Aldobrandini, I 23)



signum miloni archiepi

(ii) Milo of Paris (Archives Nationales, S 2913 no 25)

EGO MILO CANCELLARIUS RELEG ET SUBSCRIPSI

PART III

A. Introduction

It is quite clear that, on closer examination, the dossier compiled over several hundred years by a number of historians and so determinedly reworked by Becquet only serves to confuse further the already-conflicting details given in the Life of Stephen of Muret. The additional 'discoveries' made over this substantial period of time turn out to be for the most part red herrings or irrelevancies. The information given in the Life is highly inconsistent: and more than ever before the onus of proof rests with those who would argue for its historicity. We are still uncertain of the events and the chronology of Stephen's youth; the episode in which an unnamed pope - and surely Gregory VII is implied here - grants permission for the foundation of an order is completely baseless; and the figure of Milo of Benevento - the guiding force behind Stephen's spiritual development - sinks further into obscurity the more closely the evidence for his career is examined.

It is, at this point, necessary to turn to another angle of approach if we are to continue the investigation further. While previous commentators have almost uniformly confined their researches into the authenticity of the Life to the eleventh century and the twelfth only up to 1124, the date given for Stephen's death in the Vita, little has been done to connect the contents of the Life to the circumstances and period of its actual composition. So, for the time being, we can detach the Life from its southern Italian background - which remains at this stage distinctly unproven in any case - and concentrate on viewing it against that of the twelfth century: not only in the Limousin, an area known as the 'pays des saints' which saw the development of several new congregations and houses apart from Grandmont, but also in western France where the growth of eremiticism and asceticism took place on a large scale.

B The Life of Stephen: Background and Structure

What, in the first place, became of the apparently small number of disciples who had lived with Stephen of Muret when he died in 1124? We can doubt whether there was, at this stage, a well-disciplined community, let alone an order of any sort. The Life tells us that the

disciples elected one of their number, Peter of Limoges, as prior or spiritual father; and if the title of prior seems somewhat exalted for the leader of a small group there is little else questionable in the picture of leadership almost automatically devolving on one 'dear and loveable to both God and man'¹. More puzzling is the account given of the move from Muret to Grandmont. We are told that the monachi sancti Augustini began to slander them. Becquet identifies this latter group as the 'Benedictines of Ambazac' but this does not clarify the question of their identity²; and if as the Life suggests, these monks wanted the site of Muret for themselves, the situation is rendered even more inexplicable by the apparent existence of a cell at Muret after the transfer to Grandmont³. The Life attributes the disciples' eagerness to find another site to their wish to avoid litigation as this would have betrayed their custom; and perhaps in this explanation with its reference to a consuetudinem - which was certainly not a written one at this stage - and its echoes of the later Rule's injunctions against charters and litigation we can see how an original issue has become obscured. In any case, the Life also asserts that the choice of Grandmont was the result of the promptings of a divine voice heard one day during mass⁴.

The scant evidence of the Life makes no reference to any patron or provider of land at Grandmont which lies only a few miles from Muret although in a more exposed and elevated location, on a smallish hill backed by a larger and facing south⁵. The advantage of a spring on the north side of the hill seems to have been balanced out by a lack of trees which could have been used in construction. The Life may be attempting to imply that there was no landowner to whom the Grandmontines were beholden for providing their home. In fact, Grandmont was situated in an area dominated by small landowners on the borders of the county of La Marche and the viscounty of Limoges and formed part of the land belonging to the lordship of Montcocu⁶. With the seigneurs of Razès, those of Montcocu were the earliest and most faithful benefactors of Grandmont; and as the wood which covers the hill of Muret is also known as Montcocu, it is quite possible that both the move to Grandmont and the continued existence of the cells of Muret can be accounted for by this family's patronage⁷.

The community which had moved to Grandmont was to prove the nucleus

of a rapidly-expanding order, although formal recognition by the papacy was still several decades away. Indeed, there was no monastic legislation as such to approve for a considerable period after the death of Stephen of Muret. Nevertheless, we are told that a considerable number of Grandmontine houses sprang up in a comparatively short period and this may even have begun just after Stephen's death. Various figures have been bandied about in discussions of Grandmontine expansion: the Limousin historian Guibert published in 1877 a study in which he listed 163 Grandmontine houses³. Becquet estimates that of these about sixty were founded between 1139 and 1170, about forty at the end of the twelfth and the beginning of the thirteenth century and the remaining houses cannot be dated with any accuracy⁹. He observes that the houses were founded in England and throughout France - though fails to point out that there were only ever three Grandmontine houses in England¹⁰. More recently, Hallam gives a figure of 163 houses presumably relying on the figures given by Louis Guibert¹¹. If one follows the researches of Guibert and Becquet, it is clear that by far the majority of Grandmontine houses must have been situated in western France, above all in the dioceses of Limoges and Poitiers¹². When Hugh of Lacerta, the disciple whose memories of Stephen's thought are set down in the Liber de Doctrina, was on his deathbed in 1157 he expressed his distrust of the expansion which had taken place by then¹³.

Grandmont itself was situated in the county of La Marche, and it is in great measure to the combination of this geographical circumstance with its much-vaunted austerity that it owed not only its expansion but also its achievement of a considerable degree of worldly influence. Becquet has postulated the interesting and undoubtedly respectable hypothesis - followed in its entirety by Hallam - that the Grandmontines initially came to the notice of royalty through Geoffrey Eablon (or du Loroux), archbishop of Bordeaux from 1136-58¹⁴. He was the tutor of Eleanor of Aquitaine and may have recommended the Grandmontines to Louis VII who was the patron of several cells in northern France - though it is noticeable that his generosity to them dates from after his separation from Eleanor. But with her marriage to Henry II and the transfer of practical power in Aquitaine to him, Eleanor was to be once again the unintentional benefactress of Grandmont and its daughter houses.

Henry's penchant for ascetic orders is well-known and Grandmont itself possessed, perhaps, the added attraction of being on the 'front

line' of part of his French possessions: at any rate Henry was to buy the county of La Marche, in which it was situated, from its count Audebert in 1177¹⁵.

The most bizarre aspect to emerge from the Angevin patronage of the order - though not an aspect totally inexplicable or unexpected - is the number of forged documents concocted by the Grandmontines to expand the donations originally made both by Henry and by Richard I¹⁶. Indeed, by the mid-thirteenth century their conduct in this respect was considered to be a public scandal. Gaborit has argued that all the existing charters from Grandmontine houses which purport to be given by Henry or Richard are forgeries¹⁷; more recently, Hallam has shown that some originals do exist and that others are not total fictions but in fact based upon genuine originals¹⁸. Delisle, in the nineteenth century argued that the great majority of charters and bulls supposedly issued to the order in the twelfth century are forgeries, although Becquet has quite recently rehabilitated two of the earliest papal bulls for the order, those of Hadrian IV (1156) and Alexander III (? 1171)¹⁹. In fact, more work needs to be done on the Grandmontine bullarium, reconstructed by Becquet from three manuscripts: he admits for the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, much material that is suspiciously repetitive and duplicatory in nature. The bull issued by Hadrian IV may well stem from an original, though if this is so, the dating of the document makes it quite clear that it has been tampered with. Moreover its purely exhortatory nature raises something of a problem. It is not really a recognition, as such of any Rule: the gist of its message is contained in a passage which runs, 'In truth, it is not he who begins but he who perseveres to the end who obtains the prize.....we warn and earnestly exhort that you persevere without desisting - divine grace leading you - from the good work which you have begun.....'²⁰ Yet a bull of Urban III issued in 1186 clearly refers to a confirmation given by Hadrian²¹. Moreover, the so-called bull of Alexander III is nothing more than a repetition of the section in the same bull of Urban III²² which recalls the dispositions made for the order by Alexander, Lucius III and Hadrian himself although this therefore indicates the existence of another bull of Alexander. The mysterious and unreliable nature of these first two bulls for the Grandmontines may, of course, have its origins in nothing more than the Grandmontine wish to avoid charters and the troubles which these might bring with them. On the other hand, the bull of Hadrian indicates that

representations - doubtless towards the canonisation of Stephen - were being made on behalf of the order by the bishops of Limoges and Cahors, the du Chers:

....Venerabiles fratres nostri Lemovicensis et Caturcensis episcopi, ad sedem apostolicam venientes, religionem et conversationem vestram multum laudam praeconiis extulerunt et magnam inde corde nostro laetitiam magnamque gaudiam contulerunt.²³

Again, we might question the lack of discussion surrounding the bull of Alexander III, as Urban III indicates that this prescribed:

laborem loco penitentiae, et in peccatorum suorum remissionem injungimus.....²⁴

This seems to be an unusual measure: had Grandmont and its daughter-houses committed any noteworthy sins? The famous Grandmontine schism between monks and conversi - and this is hardly a unique phenomenon as the case of the Gilbertines shows - is of a later date than the bull. Had the Grandmontines then, followed the example of Cluny, and of some of the German Praemonstratensians and Cistercians in supporting the antipopes raised against Alexander?²⁵ We have no direct evidence on this point and no commentator makes any reference to such an event. But it is clear from the nature of the documents themselves that Grandmont's relationship with the papacy was, even before the revolt of the conversi and the scandal which this was to cause, rather less than straightforward and easy to define. It seems also to have escaped the notice of commentators that when Clement III recognised the Rule of Grandmont in 1133, he refers to corrections which have been made to it by Urban III - an observation which may help to throw some light, eventually, on the cryptic comments of previous popes²⁶. All this combines not only to suggest the possibility of difficulties attendant on the recognition of a Rule but also to reinforce the indications given by Delisle and Hallam of the Grandmontine capacity for falsification. This unhelpful capacity for obscuring the issue may not have been present at the period of the composition of the Life - but on the other hand there may be a connection between the unreliability of the Life and that of some Grandmontine charters.

Little comment has been passed on the Grandmontine tradition of forgery or on the possibility of papal hesitation over the recognition of a Rule in relation to the composition of the Life; and in much the

same way the question of the date of the composition of the Lives of Stephen and the relationship of these Lives to his canonisation in 1139 needs to be reviewed²⁷. The lapse of time between the death of Stephen in 1124 and the composition of the first Life (Becquet's Vita A) may in itself be considered as significant, although hardly unique as there are many similar lapses of time between the death of saints and the emergence of any other hagiographic works connected with them²⁸. However, in the case of Stephen, Becquet has defined the length of this biographical pause rather less well than one might expect from the historian who is responsible for first bringing the Vita A to our attention. According to Becquet, the great part of the first version of the Life was composed during the reign of the fourth prior Stephen of Liciac, that is at some time between 1139 and 1163. He considers, moreover, that we can be slightly more precise about this date as he believes that much of the Life was dictated by Stephen's faithful disciple Hugh of Lacerta: and this would place the composition of the Vita A between 1139 and 1153-9²⁹.

All this seems a plausible enough reconstruction, but it is capable of some further refinement. The Life of Hugh - admittedly written by a Grandmontine who never actually knew him - does not tell us precisely that Hugh played any part in the composition of the Life of Stephen of Muret: rather his memories (which he could not write for himself) were responsible for:

quidquid vel de sententiis nostris, vel ceteris vitae nostrae
mandatis invenitur fideliter scriptum, aut memoriae hominum
commendatum.....

30

This is a description of the Liber de Doctrina rather than of the Life as such; and whatever the nature of Hugh's contribution, it was deliberately solicited lest memories of Stephen should perish forever.

The dating of the Life and, by implication its nature and structure, is in fact a fairly complex matter to handle. Becquet notes that the Cambridge manuscript contains a recital of the miracles which took place under the second prior Peter of Limoges (1124-37) whereas the Paris version adds several miracles one of which refers to the fourth prior, Stephen of Liciac, in the past tense³¹. And in his edition of the Life in the Cornus Christianorum volume, although he distinguishes between these manuscript versions by letters (A and B) and in the footnotes and apparatus, Becquet follows the text of the Cambridge version of the Life with the additions of the Paris manuscript, designating the whole

as the Vita A. This virtual conflation of texts only serves to obscure several essential points. The Cambridge manuscript, although written in the thirteenth century undoubtedly comes from an earlier source and its plainness, by contrast with later versions, reveals just how flexible was the attitude of Grandmont to the Life of their founder. Chapter-headings were added to this modest enough original³²; and the list of posthumous miracles attributed to Stephen grows at virtually every turn. The Cambridge Life gives five chapters of miracles; the Paris version (which survives in a late twelfth-century manuscript) adds another four chapters; and the Life composed by Gerard Ithier which is contained in the Speculum Grandimontis gives another sixteen³³. All this indicates that a veritable dossier for the canonisation of Stephen was being prepared. Perhaps the original of the Cambridge version is very early indeed; but it is also possible that the additional miracles which appear in the Paris version were added to the accepted text of the Life soon after the former's composition - its modest miraculous content may well have been deemed insufficient. The names of priors given in the accounts of these miracles indicate that additions were being made up to 1170. The process simply continues with the Speculum Life: although the prologue written by Gerard Ithier is clearly post-canonisation as is either the whole or part of the last chapter the posthumous miracles here refer to Stephen as beatus rather than sanctus in all except two cases, where beatus and sanctus are used once each, and cover a considerable variety of dates up to the reign of the prior William of Treignac (1170-88)³⁴.

Becquet places the composition of the bulk of the Life in the reign of prior Stephen of Liciac and attributes a large role in the composition to Hugh of Lacerta; and in the Cornus Christianorum edition of Grandmontine writers he firmly separates Gerard Ithier's additions from the earlier texts³⁵. This latter aspect of presentation is, of course, extremely helpful insofar as eliminating the more repetitious passages concerning Stephen's career which are added to the Speculum Life. But Becquet's edition distracts the reader from any notion of the Life as a living organism, as a dossier designed to demonstrate the popularity of and achieve the canonisation of Stephen of Muret.

It could, of course, be argued that there is nothing particularly startling in all this: if Becquet's treatment does unintentionally obscure the continuum of miracles, there is nothing extraordinary about the way in which accounts of them were gathered or about Stephen's canonisation in 1139. The bull issued for this event by Clement III is a straightforward enough piece as the following extract reveals:

Inde siquidem fuit quod bonae memoriae praedecessor noster Urbanus, audita fama religionis et vitae commendabilis puritate, qua sanctae recordationis Stephenus Grandimontensis ordinis institutor emicuit, quantis etiam miraculorum testimoniis omnipotens Deus ipsius voluit mundo merito declarare, Legatis, quos ad partes illas direxit pro quibusdam negotiis Ecclesiae tractandis, plenam circa haec investigationem committere voluit, ut ex ipsorum ceterorumque virorum, quibus sine dubitatione fides esset adhibenda testimonio, ad id agendum consulto procederent, quod et fidelium commodis et ipsius sancti viri honori, qui hactenus velut in sterquilinio gemma latuerat, congrue videretur.

Nos etiam ex testimonio carissimi in Christo filii nostri Henrici, illustris Anglorum Regis; nec non venerabilium Fratrum nostrorum ... Cardinalium, qui in partibus illis functi sunt legationis officio, et aliorum multorum Episcoporum plenius instructi de vita meritis et conversatione, qua supradictus vir sanctus asseritur floruisse, et quod multimodis miraculorum indiciis divina voluit pietas eum illustrare; huius executionem negotii dilecti filii nostri Joanni S. Marci Presbyteri Cardinalis, Apostolicae Sedis Legati, duximus arbitrio committendam, per Apostolica illi scripta mandantes, ut ad locum vestrum accedens, et convocatis adjacentium illarum partium Episcopis, ceterisque viris religiosis, ipsum inter sanctos, auctoritate qua fungimur, nos denuntiet adscripsisse...³⁶

On the face of things, this is a very natural sequel to the attempts at pacification of the order's troubles and the recognition of the Rule in the previous year: but it also serves to emphasise once again the nature of the Life and the importance of the miracles (et quod eum multimodis miraculorum indiciis divina voluerit pietatis illustrare) in the achievement of Stephen's canonisation. And the most noticeable fact about the miracles recited in the Life is that the author can only produce two from the lifetime of the saint himself, in sharp contrast to the numbers mustered later. Again, it is noticeable that of this latter group, one incident bears a strong resemblance not only to a story related in the Life of St Bernard (as Becquet himself observes) but to four other accounts³⁷. The Life of Stephen relates that the fourth prior of Grandmont, Stephen of Liciac, attempted to send away a knight

who had appeared at Stephen's tomb seeking to be cured of a painful illness, because of his fears that the community would be disturbed by miracle-seeking crowds. So annoyed and alarmed was the prior at the miracles which were attracting such attention that he would speak to Stephen of Muret as if he were still alive, telling him sharply that if he did not leave off performing wonders, his bones would be dug up and thrown in the river! The same fears, coupled with similar threats and exhortations appear not only in one of the Bernardine Lives but also in those of St Hildulf, Robert of Chaise-Dieu, and in Carthusian and Praemonstratensian writings³³.

Using, for the sake of convenience, the chapter-divisions employed by Becquet, we can see that the text of the Life of Stephen divides into several distinct sections. Chapters 1 to 12 tell the story of Stephen's youth, his journey to Benevento, his obtaining of permission from the pope to found an order and his eventual retreat to Muret³⁹. The next eight chapters are devoted to extolling Stephen's personal sanctity, his fasts, vigils, his chanting of psalms, the prostrations which leave callouses on his knees (like those of a camel!) and curve his nose sideways⁴⁰. In chapters twenty-one to twenty-four Stephen's disciples are mentioned for the first time: his doctrines and humility are also discussed⁴¹. Then follow three chapters on the efficacy of his prayers and the miracles which were performed by him, although the writer can only recite two, while claiming that more actually took place⁴². Chapters twenty-eight and nine briefly discuss the visits which Stephen apparently received from both rich and poor, humble and great, eager to seek his advice: 'he was a father to all'. The next two sections describe the odour of sanctity which surrounded him and his particular virtues⁴³.

Chapter thirty-two in Becquet's edition is a particularly long section which describes the visit made to Stephen by two papal legates who were in France at the time. The two cardinals Gregory and Pierleone, later to become pope and antipope respectively as Innocent II and Anacletus II, descended on Stephen, evidently to determine his orthodoxy for themselves. When they heard the story of his life from Stephen's own lips, the Life says that 'they hesitated a little'.

Stephen's reassurances, coupled with those of the abbot from Limoges who had brought the cardinals, and some further explanations of the

events of his youth apparently reassured them⁴⁴. The departure of the cardinals was followed, shortly after, by the death of Stephen; and the remaining ten chapters of the Life (fourteen if we add those of the Paris MS) are taken up by accounts of the transfer to Grandmont and of posthumous miracles (including the incident in which Stephen of Liciac attempted to turn away the soldier seeking *aneure* and another miracle in which the news of Stephen's death was reported in Tours and Vezelay the day on which it occurred)⁴⁵.

The impression left by a quick survey of the Life is that, after chapter twelve, there is very little in the way of concrete information about the saint: only two miracles are reported, and of the veritable multitude of visitors whom Stephen is supposed to have received, only the two cardinals are mentioned by name. Their appearance at Muret, historically speaking a valid possibility, as they were en route for the council of Chartres held in 1124, is nevertheless a gift for the author of the Life⁴⁶. The cardinals may well have come to Stephen and may indeed have been anxious to hear the system of life which he followed: but, as things stand, the section of the Vita A which describes these events constitutes not only an opportunity for repeating the story of Stephen's visit to Italy but is also used to suggest that, eventually, two cardinals found themselves in sympathy with his ideals. This is also one of the longest sections of the Life and certainly adds some colour to an account in which the main theme, apart from that of the posthumous miracles, is Stephen's own austerity.

Of Stephen's ascetic practises, the Life gives a short account spanning chapters twenty-one to twenty-four⁴⁷. This section contains an odd mixture of some personal touches with vagueness and leaves the impression of conveying not so much *topoi* as somewhat bland pronouncements. This is not to deny the vividness of some passages: Stephen prostrated himself so often that his nose became twisted sideways and his knees developed callouses *in modum cameli*⁴⁸. He celebrated the office of the Trinity daily; he prayed and recited psalms constantly; he wore a lorica ferrea to reduce the temptations of the flesh. His diet was austere in the extreme and did not include meat, although he was later to take a little wine, propter stomachum. The dietary practises given in the Life may be those of Stephen or they may be based in part on the regulations of other orders⁴⁹. But Stephen's austerity

in food and drink is associated with the vow which he is said to have made on his entry to the 'desert' of Muret in which he promised God:

tibi me amodo servitutum in hac heremo in fide catholica.
Et propter hoc pono chartam istam super caput meum et
annulum istum in digito meo, ut in die obitus mei sit
mihi haec promissio et haec charta scutum et defensio
contra insidias inimicorum meorum.

The oath goes on to include a wish to the effect that he may be worthy to be numbered amongst the sons of holy church and also a commendation of his soul to Jesus Christ. The oath is unique in saints' lives of the period and has, as Becquet says, a certain feudal ring to it⁵⁰.

More familiar, though, is the renunciation he makes of the devil and all his pomps; and in the association of this with the promise of abstinence and a humiliation of self the Life does recall the vocabulary and spirituality of the Lives of other saints of the time⁵¹. Elsewhere, however, the recital of Stephen's virtues, humility and austerity is couched in highly conventional terms and is often skimmed - longum est enarrare⁵². Of his teaching the Life only says:

quoniam in sententiis suis scriptum est, sub silentio
praeterimus.⁵³

And what are we to make of the story of Stephen's insistence on sitting on the ground and reading to his disciples from the passions or the saints or lives of the fathers or other edifying scripture? It sounds convincing enough until one realises that the picture drawn is one of a monastic refectory rather than of a small eremitical community:

For as it is the custom in the religious life, when they
were sitting at tables in the refectory, he would humbly
sit on the ground.....⁵⁴

The chapters describing Stephen's life at Muret, his personal austerities, his psalmody and prayers are, all in all, extremely difficult to assess. His oath is unique; his austerities are - as we will see - reminiscent of those described in the Lives of other saints, although they are not described very fully. And of the more obviously charismatic elements which normally enliven accounts of the careers of saints, of the multitudes who beat a path to Stephen's retreat at Muret (not far, after all either from Limoges or from one of the major pilgrimage routes) we learn only in the most cursory or mechanical fashion. The picture of Stephen's sanctity and of his spirituality

is less revealing than might be expected and does not compare particularly well with the pictures given in the Lives of Bernard of Tiron, Robert of Arbrissel, or Robert of Chaise-Dieu⁵⁵ all of which give a much fuller account of the spirituality of the saint - or of the concerns of his biographer - than do the latter chapters of the Life of Stephen. The reader is more and more inclined to turn for supplementary information to what in sententiis suis scriptum est⁵⁶.

It is, given these circumstances, difficult to say anything really positive about the historic personality of Stephen of Muret from the evidence of the Life alone. A saint's life is not, of course, designed to provide concrete historical information; but it is interesting to note that one twelfth-century commentator expressed views along similar lines. Stephen, abbot of St Geneviève and later bishop of Tournai (1123-1203) was far from being an unbiased commentator when he composed a letter about Grandmont and Stephen in 1180; but strangely enough he succeeds in highlighting, despite his evident prejudices, two significant points concerning the order⁵⁷. The occasion of his letter was the investigation by Peter of Pavia and Robert of Pontigny in 1130-1 of the matter of two novices who had initially made their profession at Grandmont but subsequently gone on to enter a Cistercian monastery. (One of the two may have been St William of Bourges, who is nevertheless commemorated in a thirteenth-century Grandmontine calendar)⁵⁸. In these circumstances, Stephen apparently took it on himself to compose a eulogy of Cîteaux through which may be read a severe criticism of Grandmont and its institutions despite the author's profession of detachment at the beginning of the piece. At Cîteaux, he insisted, there was neither begging nor superfluity because everyone worked and the monks could both provide for themselves and give charity. The Cistercian was even more inclined to praise God because there was no worldly banter with the laybrothers. There was no greater mountain than Cîteaux (an obvious dig here) from which to offer Isaac as a sacrifice, far from the politics both of princes and of the church. He draws unfavourable comparisons between the disciplinary measures of the Grandmontines and those of the Cistercians, saying of the latter that there are no rods without the tables of the law in their arch, a reference both to the rod of Aaron and to the rod of monastic correction.

He stresses the right of the two former Grandmontines to pass ad arctiora: to the stricter life of the Cistercians. Later, he castigates the linen shifts worn by the order and the rich presents which they receive from laymen⁵⁹.

All this is typical of the sort of criticism of monks or monastic orders which seems to have been so characteristic of the time and need not be taken too seriously. But two of Stephen's charges appear to find their target more surely. He states that the Grandmontines are neither monks nor regular canons - they have laymen as superiors. This statement - or at least this type of statement - takes up one of the themes of a fragment which concludes the Liber de Doctrina and which says (defending Grandmontine practise all the while) that the Grandmontines do not dress as either monks or canons. Later, Gerard Ithier would add a section to the account of the cardinals' visit to Stephen in which the saint claimed that he and his followers hardly dared to 'usurp' the way of life of these two groups⁶⁰. Clearly, Grandmontine mores were a subject of some controversy, at least before the approval of the Rule in 1183.

Stephen's most interesting criticism of Grandmont has a distinctly modern ring to it. He says that their model - not founder - was a certain Stephen of Muret who is unknown to the Roman Church. Historians might well be inclined to fall in with the former point: like the Carthusians, the Grandmontines were to receive their Rule and organisation not from their 'founder' but as the result of the work of an energetic prior some time later. And in one perhaps significant sense, Stephen of Muret was unknown to the Roman Church. While his canonisation was achieved a few years before that of John Gualbert, and while Grandmont was taken under the protection of the Holy See before either Prémontré or la Chartreuse, Stephen of Muret achieves the unique distinction amongst founders of a major monastic order of never having been referred to in any papal document for his order before his canonisation⁶¹.

The more closely the Life is examined, the more the fact of its composition in the twelfth century (and that of its gradual composition in the twelfth century also) comes to dominate any consideration of its value. It is, of course, necessary to exercise caution here. It would

have been extremely convenient particularly in the light of Stephen of Tournai's criticisms to be able to argue that this whole corpus of the Lives was evolved because the Grandmontines were in political or institutional difficulties and were willing to submit a text at once unreliable and uninformative in a desperate bid for recognition and respectability. The facts do not support such a hypothesis. Stephen's canonisation followed the years of crisis in the order, which may even have helped in part to bring Grandmont to the papacy's attention. The reign of Alexander III represents, it is true, a long and arid stretch in papal-Grandmontine relations: but Alexander was capable not only of postponing canonisations for a considerable period of time when beset by requests for them, but also of adopting a high moral tone in some of his dealings with religious orders - as the Cistercians were to find out⁶². There is no direct evidence to suggest that Grandmont had fallen into disgrace because of its association with Henry II - indeed, William of Treignac wrote in terms of anger and bitterness to Henry when he heard of Becket's death and sent away the builders whom the king had put to work on the new church at Grandmont⁶³. Yet Stephen of Tournai's comments on Stephen of Muret might well be an ironic comment on the Life itself which obscures at least as much of Stephen as it presents to the reader. Even in the passages where Stephen's spirituality and way of life are described, the Life does not go far towards describing them - they would seem to be largely (though not entirely) irrelevant to obtaining canonisation and are described elsewhere. Stephen is obscured almost as effectively - although probably unintentionally - in this section as in the chapters which describe his journey to Italy: the structure and content of the Life as a whole reflects nothing so well as an order in search of a founder. The contents of the Liber de Doctrina were evidently inappropriate or inadequate to the needs of canonisation⁶⁴ but equally must be taken into consideration by the historian attempting to trace the origins of Grandmont and assess the basis and nature of Grandmontine spirituality.

C The Liber de Doctrina

The Liber de Doctrina is classified by Becquet as the earliest of the three early Grandmontine texts. It is known both from the manuscript Paris BN lat 10.891 and from the Speculum Grandimontis⁶⁵.

Becquet believes that the version in the Paris manuscript is not the first written text of the Liber, and orthographical evidence leads him to assert that this must be a copy from an earlier original. He places the date of its composition between 1139 and 1157 on the basis of the information supplied by later Grandmontine writers who write that the fourth prior of Grandmont, Stephen of Liciac facta beati Stephani confessoris atque instituta que bene in oblivionem devenerant conscribi and that Hugh of Lacerta voluntarily dictated to brothers from Grandmont his memories of Stephen's conversation⁶⁶.

This, in essence, is what Becquet has to say about the dating of the Liber Sententiarum, and he has supplied little else by way of comment upon this extremely interesting text. He notes, with considerable perspicacity, not only that the prologue which he prints at the head of the work in the Scriptores is a Speculum addition (!) and not in the Paris manuscript, but also that the fragment Multis modis (which has enjoyed various placings in the manuscript versions) links the Liber to the Rule⁶⁷. His conclusions concerning this latter point are sound enough, but could be carried further. In the section Multis modis, obviously an addition to the original text, we see a development of some of the themes of the Liber itself but also a move towards the codification of Grandmontine practise, a move undoubtedly made under some pressure from outside, as the text itself suggests. As in the case of the Life, Becquet neglects to ask why additions or alterations were made to the basic text: not only the evident flexibility of the placing of Multis modis but also the highly justificatory nature of its contents (which will be discussed below) certainly indicates Grandmontine worries either about the acceptability of their community or even of the doctrines of Stephen of Muret.

Nor does Becquet have a great deal to say about the authenticity of the piece - he simply assumes that it is a genuine representation of the thoughts and conversation of Stephen:

A propos of the Thoughts.....their contents correspond perfectly to what one would expect of a man of war with no education who had become disciple of a hermit and recalling to his companions the teachings of the dead saint. In this little work, which has no plan, the thought progresses by association, and a very rudimentary latin seems to clothe awkwardly thought expressed in the vulgar tongue.....⁶⁸

And he goes on to describe in a footnote the basic content of some of

the linked passages in the Liber de Doctrina.

Becquet's conclusions may be, basically, correct but even so he neglects to consider several important questions. In the first place, he seems to be unaware of the correspondence between chapter 122 which deals with the necessity of paying tithes to some passages in the sermons of St Caesarius of Arles⁶⁹. It is the ultimate chapter in the Liber (before the added fragment Multis modis) and may therefore itself be a very early addition to the basic text - certainly it stands out awkwardly on its own at the end of the work. If it does not, perhaps raise basic implications for the authenticity of the text as a whole, it nevertheless may serve, yet again, to demonstrate the highly improvisatory attitude of the Grandmontines in relation to early texts and documents.

But if the existence of chapter 122 does little in itself to question the authenticity of the Liber, this does nothing to detract from the fact that we must ask whose thoughts we are really reading. Did Hugh of Lacerta, when dictating to the monks from Grandmont (and this is assuming that the accepted version of the genesis of the book is correct) remember clearly Stephen's thoughts and views? May he not have added some ideas of his own, albeit unwittingly? Or is the Liber more a reflection of his views than of Stephen's? These questions, though of great importance are almost impossible to answer. We can, at this stage say little, except that the Liber represents an earlier stage in Grandmontine thinking than does the Rule. While there is a clear sense of a community of disciples or conversi grouped around a pastor, and more than a suggestion that the future pastor is in many chapters being instructed on the principles of running the community, there is nothing in the way of a proper institutional framework. The addition of the passage Multis modis (and even that of chapter 122 on the advisability of paying tithes) shows how painfully - and how comparatively late, the Grandmontine construction of the community's position in relation both to the world around it and to its own interior organisation was to develop. (Lack of disciplinary and constitutional foresight was to be an abiding - and disastrous - characteristic of the order over a very long period: legislation of practical value always seems to have possessed the unfortunate qualities of being too little and too late⁷⁰.)

We are dealing here with the most primitive stage of

Grandmontine thought, if it can be called such; and the energetic, if unsophisticated voice which echoes through it may well be that of Stephen of Muret himself. Whatever the truth of its earliest origins, it is the first expression of the philosophy on which the community which later became Grandmont was founded, and, despite the difficulties attendant on its interpretation, it surely deserves more attention in the context of the origins of Grandmont than its latest editor has afforded it.

What is the Liber de Doctrina or Liber Sententiarum? On the most basic level it can be described as a collection of one hundred and twenty two short chapters with an original prologue, a second prologue added in the version of the Speculum Grandimontis, and the conclusion Multis modis. It is not a rule or one of the numerous works of monastic exhortation and instruction composed in the eleventh and twelfth centuries; and it is not a commentary on a rule. It is characterised, as Becquet correctly points out, by its disjointed, inelegant and associatory nature⁷¹. It might best, if not, perhaps, entirely accurately be described as a book of table-talk, containing everything from instructions on how to deal with awkward questions on the subject of the aridity of the Holy Land, to sermons to those who have newly joined the community, to sermons ad milites. It is a work of religious philosophy - unpolished, it is true, but nevertheless essential reading if we are to elucidate the problem of the origins of the Grandmontine way of life.

The structure of the Liber de Doctrina is such that it is almost impossible to give a coherent picture of its contents, chapter by chapter. As Becquet points out, it is scarcely coherent itself. At best, he is able to point out a few examples of chapters which are linked to each other by theme, and lists a few of these themes: the beginnings of the religious life; the sweetness of God's commands; pauperes Christi; good works; accusation; alms; and humility⁷². He also signals one of the most important differences between the Rule and the Liber: while the former deals largely in the technicalities of the religious life the latter tends to talk in spiritual or psychological terms⁷³. The Liber also deals, though Becquet fails to acknowledge this, with issues which might be termed social - although if we do so we must recognise that such considerations are often inextricably bound up with the spiritual outlook of the book as a whole. Indeed, it is one of the great merits of the Liber de Doctrina that it

demonstrates, however crudely or obscurely, a connection between the religious's view of society and his approach to God a theme which is more than hinted at but not developed at such length in the Lives of other monastic-eremitical leaders of the period. Similarly, other spiritual themes of the time are often elaborated in the Liber, an important point about the work which has gone, largely, unremarked. Examined in terms of its major themes (which do not always coincide with those listed by Becquet) the Liber yields few surprises. Its originality lies, rather, in its scope as a collection and its frequent vehemence of expression: but many of the topics with which it deals have a familiar look about them in the context of the economic, social and spiritual history of the twelfth century.

If the Liber de Doctrina may be said to suffer at times as a work of literature from its unsophisticated nature and presentation, there are occasions on which its very unpolishedness is its strength. There can be few more effective beginnings in the canon of religious thought than the simple declaration, 'There is no Rule save the Gospel of Christ!'⁷⁴ which prefaces the prologue to the Liber. But despite its confident beginning, the prologue provides an opportunity for doubts to be expressed as well as assertions made. Straightforward disciplinary fundamentalism leads directly to other more problematic considerations:

Brothers, know that after my death, men will ask what order or rule is followed by you, some because they wish to learn, others because they wish to reprove you. Reply humbly to them, 'You ask which rule as if there were two and not one rule, that is, unity. Our Lord Jesus Christ is the only way by which the heavenly kingdom may be reached.....'⁷⁵

This indicates more than a little uncertainty about the existence and beliefs of the Muretian community - the reader is irresistably reminded of the account given of the visit of the two cardinals to Stephen and of the opportunity thus provided for a second (and suspicion-allaying) narration of the events of Stephen's youth.

The reliance placed upon the Gospel in the Liber de Doctrina is, while undoubtedly in keeping with the spirit of the times, extreme, and the rejection of the known monastic rules which accompanied it evidently caused comment. The prologue to the Liber is also quite explicit in its rejection of other monastic rules which - in a theme developed more succinctly and elegantly in the prologue to the Rule -

it characterises as man-made (and therefore, presumably, imperfect) and potentially infinite in number⁷⁶. That this attitude was to cause unfavourable or suspicious reaction until the approval of a Grandmontine rule by Clement III is made clear from another passage in the Liber, the concluding fragment Multis modis:

You will be told by many, 'this is a novelty to which you hold: it is neither an order nor a rule of the doctors of the holy church'. But I tell you that although those who so address you bear the apparel or sign of religion, they have denied their way of life by their ignorance of what constitutes an order or rule. To such men you should make this answer: 'Since you condemn our way of life and customs we will willingly amend our ways - if you can adduce evangelical authority to us'. Thus, brethren, if they cannot immediately answer you, begin to rehearse the institutions of our way of life in this fashion.....⁷⁷

And, in the Speculum version of the Life, Gerard Ithier was to expand the account of the visit of the two cardinals to Stephen with an explanation of his refusal to 'usurp' (as he put it) the office of monk or canon⁷⁸.

The rejection of the Rule of St Benedict might well have laid Stephen and his followers open to the charge of being the disreputable 'seculars' described in the Libellus de Diversis Ordinibus:

I do not know what to say about the monks who are called seculars, since they do not follow the monks' way of life and the life they follow is nowhere described. From the negligence of masters and from the plentifulness of things at some times and the shortage of them at others, this way of life is becoming more and more common. For it sometimes happens that affluence produces dissoluteness.....⁷⁹

Later on, to judge by the extract quoted above from Multis modis, the charge brought against them was that of novelty. The brothers were instructed to defend themselves against such allegations by an enumeration of their practises - the injunctions about possession of property, against allowing relatives to visit the community, against entering castles or towns, against going to markets and fairs, against possession of land, churches, or tithes⁸⁰. All these specifications indicate a move away from the more tenuous thought of the rest of the Liber and towards the provisions of the Rule, and the monks are now being instructed to ask whether these rulings exclude them from being considered as an order or mean that they live without a rule.

From the prologue to the Liber de Doctrina and from the subsequent developments of the theme of adherence to the Gospel and to extreme poverty, it is clear that the Muretian community stubbornly

insisted upon its 'humility' and consequently refused to be classified in terms of either monks or canons. The Liber constantly refers either to 'brothers' - a more neutral term - or to 'disciples' or to conversi - laymen who have been converted to a life of religion. If the impression given by the Liber is at all reliable, Stephen of Muret evidently believed that those who had chosen to follow him would be sustained by the Gospel and by his own spiritual guidance. But developments both inside and outside the community ensured that this could not last long.

The practical guidance provided by Stephen of Muret must have been extremely limited: the Liber de Doctrina itself is largely concerned with more general spiritual problems than with the details of administering a monastic community. This circumstance alone would probably have ensured the later development or adoption of a rule of life. But such a change was also precipitated, as the passages quoted above show, by external pressures: in the chain beginning with the prologue to the Liber linking it to Multis modis, to the Rule and ultimately to certain passages added to the Speculum Life, we possess a particularly explicit reference to these pressures. Undoubtedly the charge of novelty hit hard. The Liber reveals that these charges were made, as we would expect, by other churchmen in keeping with the general tone of the twelfth-century polemic which surrounded new orders and communities.

By stressing its adherence to poverty and, more importantly, to the Gospel Muret (or Grandmont) was doing its best to avoid the type of accusation levelled in the poem of Payen Bolotin against the 'false hermits', propagators of 'religious monstrosities'⁸¹. In the twelfth century 'new' was often (although not inevitably) a dirty word when applied in a religious context. Smalley has recently remarked that 'The sharpest polemic on innovation in the twelfth century centred on the new religious orders'⁸² although she scarcely pauses to ask why this might be. This question is in fact answered indirectly elsewhere in the same article: 'No theologian called his book The New Theology'⁸³. For novelty which was pursued and persisted in, in the face of disapproval, was only one step away from heresy as the poem of Payen Bolotin suggests when it classifies hermits and innovators as one of the four horsemen of the apocalypse, that is one of the four kinds of enemies of the church. The other three are pagans, persecutors - and schismatics⁸⁴. Respectability was essential not just for the continued

success of a community but for its basic survival: hence the insistence of these passages on the community's adherence to the Gospel, its avoidance of luxury or of doubtful practise. It wished, passionately, to be recognised as orthodox and included within the framework of the church and carefully primed its members with defence against all criticisms. The Liber provides at once this defence mechanism as well as exposition of the basic tenets of Grandmontine belief.

Before going on to discuss some of the major themes of the Liber de Doctrina it might be appropriate to consider the references to the Rule of St Basil contained in the prologue to the Liber (and repeated at the beginning of the Rule). At first glance, the reference to Basil might be taken as indicating dependence upon him but closer inspection reveals that this is not the case:

When, however, someone says that a rule was composed by St Benedict, the same could be said of the blessed apostle Paul and of St John the Evangelist who spoke more fully and more perfectly of Our Lord.....(the Rule of St Benedict) is, to be sure, of great perfection, but another (rule) is of greater, that is to say the Rule of St Basil. But yet all is taken from a common rule, that is, the Gospel, without which not one will be saved.....⁸⁵

A less elaborate presentation of this theme, in which the Rule of St Augustine is also mentioned is given in the prologue to the Grandmontine Rule entitled De unitate and diversitate regularum⁸⁶.

This, of course, does not indicate any dependence upon Basil: once again it is devotion to the words and message of the Gospel which is being emphasised. The reference to Basil probably stems from nothing more than a wish to demonstrate knowledge of monastic legislation. Reference to, or knowledge of those portions of Basil which had reached the west was a feature of western monastic writing from a very early stage: Benedict of Nursia himself advised in chapter 73 of his Rule that 'the whole of perfection' was not contained in his writings and he recommended the use of 'the Conferences of the holy fathers, and their Lives and the Rule of our holy father Basil.....'⁸⁷. Benedict of Aniane at one stage discarded the Benedictine Rule as fit only for 'beginners or weaklings' and followed in its place the Rules of Pachomius and Basil. (The Basilian Rule is also mentioned in his Codex Regularum)⁸⁸. Leclercq tells us that:

We find Basil present at all epochs in western monastic

history, in important monasteries which, in more than one instance, were themselves sources of expansion or centres of reform.⁸⁹

In the eleventh and twelfth centuries, both black and white monks, both old and new houses used Basil: Cluny in the eleventh century possessed four volumes of Basil's writings and a monk read the Dicta S Basilii during Lent. Monte Cassino had two volumes of Basil's writings at this period, and in the twelfth century not only Grandmont itself but the Grande Chartreuse, Mont-Dieu; Cîteaux, Clairvaux, Pontigny, Vauclair, Cambron, Aulne, and Clairmarais (all Cistercian); St Amand, Auch, St Bertin, Admont, Jumièges, Fécamp, La Couture and a number of Italian houses all possessed copies of some of Basil's works⁹⁰. The more general questions raised by the idea of eastern influence on Stephen will be discussed at a later stage: suffice it to say for the moment that the direct references to Basil in the prologues to the Liber and the Rule must be interpreted as customary and comparative allusions, and that the text itself reveals that Stephen is not consciously dependent on Basil.

One of the few passages in the Liber de Doctrina which has attracted any attention whatsoever deals with the problems confronting the knight who wishes to perform both his lawful and his Christian duty:

It shows admirable knowledge, and is very pleasing to God, when a man who is involved in an evil enterprise restrains himself from evil. It can be done like this. If a knight is setting out on an expedition for the sake of his secular lord, to whom he cannot refuse obedience, if he wishes to be faithful to God, let him first speak thus in his heart: 'Lord God, I will go on this expedition, but I promise that I will be your knight there, wanting nothing in it except to be obedient to you, to eradicate evil and to seek after what is good on every occasion as much as I can.'⁹¹

When the knight sets out with this intention, his conduct on the expedition should be merciful and consist in such good deeds as defending his allies from evil, and taking prisoners for ransom before others but then releasing them.

...and thus he can be a monk, wearing a shield upon his neck.⁹²

Knights figure prominently in other passages too. The simile of a besieged knight is chosen to illustrate the position of a religious outside a community:

It is an inexperienced knight who, under no compulsion, and without fear, leaves the defences where he is safely

established, goes out among his enemies by whom he is being besieged, and acts in a way which leads to his capture by them. Similarly, the religious remains safe, as long as he stays in the cloister.....⁹³

safe from diabolic stratagems. A comparison of the lord-knight relationship is used in another chapter to illustrate God's joy at man's successful resistance of temptation. On a more practical level, it emerges that the Muretian community itself contained some former knights (we know from other sources that Hugh of Lacerta was himself a knight) as the speaker is concerned that the brothers should not be allowed to hear news from outside the community lest they be tempted to aid friends in their struggles⁹⁴.

The rise of a class of knights was to have its effect on the Liber's explanation of some of the aspects of the monastic or ascetic life of the time - its use, for instance, of knightly or feudal comparisons to illustrate the advantage to the religious of remaining within a community or to exhort him to resist temptation. This type of usage is occasionally paralleled in a saint's life where the struggles of the athlete of Christ are translated into knightly or, at least, military vocabulary⁹⁵. In the case of the Liber, the use of the knight as example was probably a necessity in instructing ex-knights such as Hugh of Lacerta whose sensibilities must still have been partly attuned to the world outside the community.

In indicating the existence of former knights at Muret or Grandmont, the Liber de Doctrina merely signals a phenomenon which is to be found in the lives of several of the monastic leaders of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. The first disciple of Robert of Chaise-Dieu was a knight; the first disciples of the hermit of the forest of Colan, in the Life of Robert of Molesme, were two knights who had originally decided to fight to the death; Bernard apparently converted a group of knights to a life of religion by the 'miracle of the beer'⁹⁶. There are other examples of this tendency to be found in the literature of the period, all the more so as many monastic founders were themselves of noble or knightly condition. The father of Stephen of Muret himself is originally described as vir nobilissimus. St Bernard, the son of the lord of Fontaine-lès-Dijon, was converted to his life of religion on his way to join his brothers at a siege. On a more humble level, the notorious Pons de Léras gave up a career

of noble brigandage in the south of France to found what eventually became a Cistercian house⁹⁷. The noble troubadours Bertrand de Born and Bernard of Ventadour both became Cistercians⁹⁸. The various connections between knighthood, nobility and warfare or anarchy and the rise of the religious life all, of course, deserving of much more detailed and extended treatment than can be given here. This brief excursus is merely designed to show that, in indicating the presence of former knights in the community, the Liber is in broad conformity with other northern European sources of the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

Colin Morris has already commented on the sermon ad milites in which the Liber attempts to reconcile the duties of a knight with those of a Christian. He demonstrates that the passage in question represents a sympathetic approach to the knight who was already struggling with this problem and is one more instance of the efforts made by the churchmen of the period to convert malitia into a truly Christian militia⁹⁹. The Liber's injunctions to the knight to release his captives without demanding ransom almost recalls Orderic Vitalis' comment on the battle of Brémule (1119):

These Christian warriors did not thirst for the spilling of their brothers' blood but by God's gift they celebrated a lawful triumph which was useful to holy church and brought peace to the faithful.¹⁰⁰

The encouragement provided to the knights who fulfilled such expectations was peculiarly appropriate in the context of the society of southern France and the Limousin itself. At the Council of Limoges, in 1031, knights who refused to maintain peace and justice were excommunicated¹⁰¹. When Urban II preached the First Crusade in southern France in 1095, he is said to have declared that 'now they may become knights who hitherto existed as robbers'¹⁰². The Limousin was ravaged, in the eleventh century, by numerous guerres privées¹⁰³ Guy I of Limoges was at war, at the beginning of the century, with a coalition under the count of Poitiers and at one stage in this struggle he imprisoned the bishop of Périgueux in Limoges - although he eventually expiated his sins by a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. His sons Adhemar I and grandson Guy II lead rather more peaceful lives; but in the Bas-Limousin, during the eleventh century, the descendants of Archambaud I 'the Butcher' engaged in a long series of struggles with their

neighbours. At the beginning of the twelfth century, around 1105, Guy de Lastours of Pompadour and Gaucelin de Pierrebuffières ravaged the lands of the viscount of Limoges, Adhemar III, and put the population to flight. When the viscount returned from a pilgrimage, he was shut up in the castle of Ventadour. The county of La Marche to the north of the Limousin was subject to similar depredations throughout the period¹⁰⁴. Abbeys and churches were not safe either: on one occasion, the monks of Vigeois had to flee from the lords of Comborn who massacred all their serfs and the house of L'Esterps was burned to the ground during the lifetime of its founder Gauthier¹⁰⁵.

The twelfth century was to bring with it some political change when Aquitaine was incorporated first within the Capetian, then the Angevin state, but the picture of a violent society dominated by the conflicts of the powerful endures. It is true that under Henry II (who placed himself in the tradition of the counts of Poitiers by having himself crowned at Limoges) the area enjoyed a dozen years of peace, with the checking of the most turbulent feudatories and the quashing of the insubordination of the bourgeoisies of Limoges and La Souterraine. But from the 1160s onwards, new revolts broke out and were exacerbated in the 1170s by the formation of coalitions against Henry. The harsh rule of Richard over the Limousin was to turn, between 1176 and 1178, into the suppression of a revolt and the eventual entry of Richard's brothers into the struggle in roles hostile to both himself and his father. The career of the young king, Henry II's eldest son, was to end ignobly in the 1180s in this internecine struggle after his sacking of several churches and shrines including Grandmont and Rocamadour. The history of the region up to the end of the twelfth century is characterised by accounts of revolts, suppressions, and the financial and military exhaustion of the nobles of the area¹⁰⁶.

The crusade, of course, provided a release for some of these tensions. Limousin and other local nobles are known to have taken part in both the first and the second crusades: the two best known examples are provided by the bishop of Périgueux who departed for the Holy Land on the First Crusade, and the troubadour Jaufré Rudel, famous for his amor de lonh for the countess of Tripoli. The Chanson D'Antioche was written by a member of the noble Limousin family of Lastours.¹⁰⁷ The Liber de Doctrina may reveal not only the presence of knights in the community, but also the presence of those who had returned from

crusade, among them perhaps, Hugh of Lacerta. At the very least, there is a consciousness of the landscape of the Holy Land in the section where the pastor is advised how to deal with recruits who ask why it is that, if the Holy Land is favoured by God above all other countries, it is so barren and arid. Yet despite these diversions, the Limousin was to retain its warlike character in the twelfth century - as the well-known poems of Bertrand de Born vividly demonstrate¹⁰⁸. While we must conclude, with Morris, that the attempts of the Liber to offer godly advice to the good knight were part of a wider phenomenon, we should not forget the local dimension which gives to this part of its message a peculiar relevance and urgency.

The passages concerning knights, and in particular the sermon ad milites, reflect the interpenetration of social and religious themes so characteristic of the Liber de Doctrina. While it contains a specific injunction to avoid the world, its vision is naturally forced to turn beyond the bounds of the community in order to explain not only some of the prevalent evils of the time but also just how delight in worldly things may be ended and a truly religious life begin. One of the key themes in the Liber is that of the evils of usury:

In usury, wrong is done in many ways, but worst of all by the man who accepts pledges. Afterwards, towards the end of his life, he takes them up and says to his son (or to whomever he wishes to leave them) saying - his actions speaking louder than his words - 'Son, I am dying and I have assailed God as long as I have lived, but that isn't enough for me; I leave you in my place and you can attack Him with this usury.' From this it can be said that even after his death he is still a moneylender, busily putting his money to usurious purposes. Whatever is received from him is usury, on account of what has been done.¹⁰⁹

And the Liber also suggests that the usurer has extorted tithes or land.

In this naive and vivid picture is concentrated a loathing of usury so extreme that it cannot admit of the usurer's unconsciousness of his sin: lending money at interest or accepting pledges is portrayed as a direct and deliberate attack upon God. And if the moneylender is treated harshly, so is the man who has recourse to him as the immediately preceding passage shows:

Whoever accepts (money at) usury does wrong, and he who gives it out, the same, in this way: when someone extravagantly incurs expenses which his means cannot support, over food, clothing, or other things.....(and)

presently goes straight to the moneylender on account of this superfluity, the one sins in the money which he lends to him, just as the other does by accepting it. For he would never suffer any want if he had lived modestly.....¹¹⁰

In other words, recourse to usurers is made out of improvidence and extravagance rather than because of genuine poverty or real distress.

The concern over usurious activity is broadly in keeping with twelfth-century developments: if the ideas represented here are indeed those of Stephen of Muret, it seems more likely that they were expressed at the end of his career than at its beginning, as the turning-point for legislation on usury at this period is represented by canon 13 of Lateran 2 (1139)¹¹¹. This forbids any churchman, 'except with the utmost caution' to receive usurers and deprives them of all ecclesiastical consolation (and even of Christian burial, if they do not recant). The difficulties raised by this rigorous legislation are shown in the efforts of the canonists to define various types of usurious activity or exceptions to such definitions. Such discussion appears to have arisen among French theologians in the latter part of the twelfth century and it is interesting that the Liber considers the usurer likely to accept pledges or hold tithes or other lands: while Peter the Chanter, for instance, discusses tithes and usury, it is in relation to the pledging of tithes to churchmen by laymen, a possibility perhaps too shocking to be considered in the Liber¹¹². Its attitude is certainly more in keeping with that of Pope Urban III who declared that even the hope of usury made a merchant a usurer¹¹³.

The end of the twelfth century and the beginning of the thirteenth saw great preaching campaigns against usury in France. One of these was centred in the south, in the diocese of Toulouse which was doubly afflicted by the scourges of heresy and usury. (There is no reason, I think, to connect the two phenomena, or to offer reasons for their non-connection, as Bolton has attempted to do.)¹¹⁴ The former troubadour Fulk of Marseilles, elected bishop of Toulouse in 1205 saw it as his duty to stamp out a social evil in his diocese, perhaps under the influence of the preaching campaign of Robert of Courçon, and took various measures to this end including the setting up of a confraternity devoted jointly to the extirpation of heresy and usury¹¹⁵. We do not

possess any studies of the Limousin in the eleventh and twelfth centuries which might indicate to us social tensions of the nature of those which existed in Toulouse during this period and which contributed to the growth of usury as well as unorthodox religious beliefs. Nevertheless, the Liber's concern can probably be used as a crude barometer for the situation in Limoges and the surrounding area; and if the concern expressed in some ways prefigures later events in the Toulousain, the manner of its expression fits in remarkably well with some of the literary evidence from the south of France and from Limoges itself in the twelfth century. The chronicler Geoffroy de Vigois, for instance, remarks of the people of the Château of Limoges, the area of the town in which the famous Limoges enamels were made, that they were 'grown so rich that they obeyed no-one'¹¹⁶. Here is evidence of some kind of social tension connected with the use of money and perhaps with usury.

Relevant, also, is the picture of the way of life of the nobility of southern France as drawn by the troubadours of the twelfth century: if the Liber had to attempt to come to terms, for one reason or another with the existence of a knightly class, might it not also have been forced to consider the nobility's apparent habit of conspicuous consumption? For Bertrand de Born depicts the nobility not only as guerrejadors but as bos majadors and boasted that Limousins knew how to 'give - and laugh'. The nobles of the region are chassadors, tornejadors, larcs et bos donadors¹¹⁷. Geoffrey de Vigois professed himself scandalised by the new and extravagant fashion of his time and declares that artisans now would blush to wear the simple sheepskin coats of the old viscounts! He also tells various stories - of differing historical value - which illustrate very well the importance attached by the nobility to making a great show. Extravagant display was not seen as a cause for reproach but rather as part of the vie courtoise. Geoffrey relates a tale told of the first two known troubadours, Ebles II of Ventadour and William of Poitiers: having been magnificently received by his suzerain William, the poorer Ebles then received a surprise visit from him - and over a hundred knights - one evening, just as dinner was about to be served. Ebles, maintaining remarkable composure in the face of impending disgrace, was saved by one of his people who brought a vast quantity of food (and in one case, a consignment of fine wax candles) to the table. The donor of the candles was later rewarded with the fief of his village of Maumont

and William (who in real life was to evoke the luxury of fur in his last song) departed much impressed by Ebles' courtoisie. Geoffroy also recounts, in similar vein, the extravagant celebrations held by Henry II in 1174 to mark the occasion of the reconciliation of the Duke of Narbonne with the King of Aragon - although this account may be a little more reliable - in its details at least - than the last¹¹⁸.

Yet in the final analysis, both Bertrand de Born and Geoffroy were to show considerable disquiet at the turn society was taking at the weakening of traditional structures. The taste for luxurious clothes was descried by the latter because it made the nobility forget its duty of giving alms to the poor; and the troubadour expressed regret at the self-centred existence of so many of the rics oms who now economised on the largesse given to their vassals. The words of the Liber may well provide us with further literary evidence of all these phenomena, for there is no hint of recourse to the usurer because of real poverty or dire emergency, only because of extravagance or superfluity in 'food, clothing or other things.....'. Once again, the Liber's concerns appear to be highly relevant not only to French, but to southern French and Limousin society in the twelfth century, its ideas broadly in tune with those of this area and this period.

While the treatment of the theme of usury in the Liber de Doctrina reflects to some extent the concerns of other commentators, its place in the spiritual and social scheme outlined there must not be forgotten. If the Liber exhibits a fanatical hatred of usury, it places by contrast, a high importance upon the good work of alms-giving, portraying it as a necessary act for individual salvation:

After a man is dead, he has no good friend left: they have all left him and returned home. The demons who wish to capture his soul are not, indeed, far away. Only alms will not desert him - if they have been given by him. They go before him, and, placing the soul behind them, forming a shield against the demons who wish to carry him off, pushing them off, they say to them 'Don't you see me here?' and to the soul, 'Don't be afraid!' Then, coming to the judgement before God, the devil lists his accusations, saying, 'Thus and thus he has done my will'. The alms reply, 'Whatever he has done, I give him immunity from all his sins.

It is good to acquire such an ally.....¹¹⁹

The Liber devotes several passages to the giving of alms, explaining the difference between a good man and a foolish one, who gives only

out of vainglory¹²⁰. In the hands of a good man, however, alms 'grow, flower, and bear fruit'¹²¹. The giving of alms to the poor in general is to be preferred above giving exclusively to friends and relations (as this springs from fleshly or earthly love with the consequence that the left hand takes away from the right)¹²². And the Liber sketches a rapid if somewhat crudely drawn picture of the virtuous man giving alms to the poor, fearing recognition while performing this good deed¹²³.

While usury clearly represents the negative side, spiritually speaking, of the changing economic circumstances of the time, almsgiving clearly stood for a positive means by which man might attain to God - as well as being a social duty. But almsgiving not only ensures individual salvation (and this is in agreement with several biblical texts while the sketch of the almsgiver clearly owes much to Christ's injunction to give alms unobtrusively): it is also a manifestation of and means of the conversion to a life of religion. The true pauperes Christi, according to the Liber, are those who give away all they have as alms, and they can now rejoice as they themselves will become the recipients of alms¹²⁴. While it is undoubtedly true that the Liber regards the giving of (justly-earned) alms to the poor as a worthy deed in itself, it is equally true that it encourages the idea that it is even better not to hold anything back for oneself and to become a pauper Christi¹²⁵. It is interesting to note that these enthusiasms, and probably the latter in particular, lead to a curiously casual reference to the problem of the community's own provision for the poor: the leader is simply advised not to neglect his own by excessive zeal for charity to outsiders¹²⁶. Grandmont, however, did not neglect the problem of provision for the poor in future years and the Rule enjoins that the poor be received joyfully, although in keeping with its doctrine of strict seclusion it forbids the monks to go outside the house to minister to them.¹²⁷

The equation of almsgiving with the opportunity for conversion and the embracing of a life of voluntary poverty recalls, of course, the career of Valdès, who embarked on his life of poverty by giving the greater part of his wealth to the poor (and also by running a soup-kitchen in time of famine). But while the story of Valdès' devotion to the injunction that '...you cannot serve God and money' obviously bears a very close relationship to this aspect of the teaching of the Liber de Doctrina, another aspect of his lifestyle

represents an extension of the Liber's tenets. While the Liber strongly encourages both the community at Muret and the layman to live by the Gospel, Valdès went one step further and actually preached it and had scripture translated into the vernacular¹²⁸. And there is a recognisably pre-Franciscan element in the teaching of the Liber in addition to this anticipation of Valdès. While the Liber itself places a very high importance on the doctrines of almsgiving and poverty, it never goes so far as to develop the ultimately perilous Franciscan notion that Christ himself, his mother, and his disciples all lived by alms. Yet the germ of the idea was present at Grandmont: in chapter fourteen of the Rule the monks are enjoined to apply themselves to communicating with God, 'so that you may be poor in this life, just as he was, and thus you will be perpetually rich just as he is in eternity'¹²⁹. This passage, which recalls Luke XII, 33 and represents a perhaps unconscious radicalisation of Grandmontine beliefs, partly paved the way for the Franciscans.

As well as prefiguring some of the concepts associated with both Valdès and Francis, the emphasis placed by the Liber on poverty as a means to a life of religion has obvious connections with other elements, notably those present in southern French society in the twelfth century. The appeal of movements associated with poverty and charity in this region was extraordinary, spanning, as it did both sides of the orthodox-heterodox divide. The case of Valdès provides one instance of the heretical poverty-movement (although this is a controversial case, given the history of the Waldensian 'exclusion' from the church). But both Peter of Bruys, burned at St Gilles in the second decade of the twelfth century, and Henry the Monk, imprisoned in 1145, included poverty as part of their programme of opposition to the church¹³⁰. Even the Cathars may be said to have acknowledged to some extent the ideal of poverty as part of the truly religious life¹³¹. However, an emphasis on poverty was hardly the exclusive preserve of heretical or even of southern French society alone: in a general way the vocabulary of poverty formed part of the religious mentality, from Bernard, who described himself as servus pauper Christi de Clara-valle to the Life of Gerard of Salles, which describes how he went from being a poor canon to being an even poorer hermit¹³². For Bernard, whatever the reality at Cîteaux and Clairvaux, poverty and spirituality were virtually synonymous. And it is interesting to see that, as far as the question

of the actual wealth or poverty of monasteries was concerned, the office of Mary, associated by the Liber with renunciation of the world, was, for Guigo of La Chartreuse, already poor by definition - regardless, presumably, of the realities of the situation¹³³.

At Grandmont there was, in the early days at least, little or no apparent desire to make life easier for the community by availing themselves of the excuse implied in Matthew V, 3, that if they did possess anything they nevertheless did so as pauperes spiritu¹³⁴. The poverty of Grandmont - as is suggested in the Liber and institutionalised in the Rule - which took no thought for the morrow and in this recalls, once again, both Valdès and Francis. Although the Grandmontines lived outside towns and were forbidden to enter them, let alone pursue any form of commercial activity, they appear to have counted in the early stages at least on a sort of limited mendicancy by which they hoped (and how impractical this seems) to support themselves in hard times. Associated with the basic and common concept of poverty (although the Grandmontines gave this their own individual stamp) was that of a grim austerity and consciousness of the cross. The Liber recalls a sermon of Stephen of Muret to those who desired to embark on a life of religion:

Brother, how will you be able to bear the burden which you wish to place on yourself? Look at the cross - it is very difficult to remain there. If you come here, you will be nailed to it and lose the power which you have over yourself, over your eyes, over your mouth, your other limbs. You are giving up your free will in eating, fasting, sleeping and wakeing, and in many other things; and what you love in the world, let it fill you with hate.....you will not go back to the house of your family and if they come to you, on no account show them your poverty.

Brother, will you be able to be a digger of ditches, to carry wood and dung, and to serve all your brothers?.....

The rest truly is more horrible: it is a hundred times better for you to be damned in the world than here: for he who falls from a higher place is dashed more furiously to the ground and if you fall into hell from here, you will be lower than all the other lost souls. You can, indeed, go into whatever monastery, where you will find vast buildings and the best food served at the appointed times. There you will find animals and great landed possessions: here, only the cross and poverty.¹³⁵

The uncompromising - and, of course, deliberately testing - picture held out by Stephen to his recruits recalls his own austerities as they are described in the Life. There is, perhaps, even a trace of pride in

the awful prospect which Stephen holds out to the aspirant and even in this short passage a great part of the essence of the deliberately austere monastic life can be seen. The total renunciation of self-will, symbolised by crucifixion, represents the monastic virtue of obedience and Stephen himself vowed that he would serve God in his hermitage. Physical privation and hardship is associated with humility in the list of the wearisome and unpleasant tasks which the recruit will have to perform. (Stephen's own cultivation of humility is signalled in the Life which records that he sat on the floor at mealtimes and read passages from the passions of the saints or the lives of the fathers and wished to be regarded as the least among his community¹³⁶.)

The tribulations which the disciples suffered were evidently modelled on, if not absolutely identical to, the privations which Stephen imposed on himself. Such austerities are echoed - or are echoes of - the accounts which we find in the Lives of other eremitical saints of the period. A common theme is the refusal of the saint himself to eat meat - Stephen's own frugal and meatless diet is outlined in the Life. Disregard for food and drink amounting to a neglect of disciples as well as self is mentioned in the Lives of Robert of Chaise-Dieu and William Firmat (and the giving away of their own bread to the poor is a convenient opportunity for a demonstration both of the saint's charity and of the divine providence which miraculously replaces the lost provisions)¹³⁷. Struggles with the devil are numerous and recall some of the early chapters of the Liber which deal with the problem of temptation. The currency of the lives of men such as Robert, William, and Robert of Arbrissel was evidently, fasts, vigils, abstinence, prayer - in some cases the constant recital of psalms, hymns, and canticles. Their flesh was mortified both waking and sleeping, the privations which they imposed upon themselves were extreme¹³⁸. And, as in the Liber de Doctrina the vocabulary of the cross is frequently employed to describe their struggles. The Life of William Firmat refers to his crucifixion of the world and his meditation on Christ's sufferings on the cross; that of Gerard of Sales to a life led totus in cruce et martyrio¹³⁹. The sermon which Bernard of Tiron is said to have preached in defence of his right to preach contains an elaborate exposition of his own position which he compares to that of the ass's jawbone - dead, as Bernard as a monk was 'dead to the world', but both were the instruments of God and the ass's jawbone itself was a prefiguration of the dead Christ¹⁴⁰. And one of the most striking passages of the Liber itself is that which describes a painting of the crucifixion, with Adam at the

foot of the cross, holding one hand out to Christ and indicating all the good men in hell who were awaiting Christ's resurrection and deliverance. The purpose of the metaphor appears to be to demonstrate man's ignorance - as it is, it remains one of the few truly striking passages in the Liber because of the image which it conjures up¹⁴¹. It is interesting that Becquet apparently rejects a classification of the Rule of Grandmont as penitential in nature: what the Rule sets out to do is to provide an institutional framework for the type of existence envisaged in the Liber, where the renunciation of the world, the emphasis on austerity and obedience and the use of the symbol of the cross all certainly indicate a strong penitential element, despite its somewhat unconvincing attempt to emphasise (in a faint echo of the great theme of De Diligendo Deo) the sweetness of God and his commands¹⁴².

The only conclusion which can be drawn from these selections from the difficult and incoherent work which is the Liber de Doctrina is that its spirituality is firmly rooted in the society of western Europe and in particular that of southern France in the twelfth century that the question of extraneous influence is not only inadmissible but also irrelevant. Individual aspects of the Liber's teaching indicate the existence of a web of ties which bind it not only to the religious movement which was taking place throughout France at the time but also to the society which surrounded Muret and Grandmont. But it is not merely the case that the concerns of the Liber are reflected or developed in other works of western monastic or religious literature of the time: it could be argued that they are such as to decisively remove all question of southern Italian or Byzantine influence from discussion of Grandmont.

In view of the clear emphases on poverty and austerity present in the Liber, it may seem foolhardy to argue against any trace of Byzantine influence on its thought: but it is precisely the nature of these emphases which indicate that the Liber is a work imbued with an exclusively western spirituality. At the risk of stressing the obvious once again, the Liber's means of spiritual renewal and of conversion to a life of religion are based on the embracing of voluntary poverty in a gesture of complete renunciation. By this act, spiritual rebirth was achieved; and if the renunciant was one of those who had chosen to

enter Stephen's community he would lead there a life in which the pursuit of poverty, austerity and humility was all-important. Poverty, in this schema (this is a condensation, of course, of several related elements in the Liber) is not presented as an end in itself, as the Liber stresses more than once the importance of having the right intention in whatever action one performs. Nevertheless, poverty is indeed the distinguishing mark of the Liber's spirituality as it is in that - for example - of Francis: poverty is both the mark of conversion and the mark of the converted. The Rule of Grandmont was designed to institutionalise this poverty.

All this, it could be argued, is not so far removed from the world of the Byzantine ascetic, famed for his disdain for worldly goods and for his mortifications of the flesh. But if the western monk was following tradition as well as his own inclinations (and, given the nature of monasticism, we must suppose that he was) then he could do so by reference to the common traditions of the monastic life, those of Antony and the desert fathers, those reported by Cassian as well, of course, as those of Basil. It has been argued that monastic sources, and Cassian in particular, enjoyed a vogue from the eleventh century on¹⁴³. Reference to monastic tradition is even enshrined in one of the little scenes from the latter part of the Life of Stephen, which shows him seated on the ground at mealtimes, reading to his disciples vitae patrum et passiones sanctorum¹⁴⁴. While this is a topos from monastic life it is nevertheless a significant one, because it emphasises western monastic reliance on the comparatively early sources from the east. By contrast, great southern Italian ascetics such as St Nilus derived their strength and peculiar nature not only from the early (and common) monastic sources, but partly from a tradition of contemplative spirituality which, if not entirely unknown in the west thanks to the work of Erigena, is foreign to the thought of the Liber de Doctrina and to much of the western monastic movement of the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

It is not my purpose here to give a history of the development of the eastern contemplative traditions or their attendant theological intricacies from the desert fathers, through the early theologians, to John Climacus and Symeon the New Theologian and finally the hesychasts:

this would be an extraordinarily lengthy business and has been done excellently elsewhere by the experts¹⁴⁵. My purpose is to stress that, in the Byzantine world, poverty and austerity were only part of a long process by which God - and the image of God contained in man, at that - could be found. Poverty, austerity and humility were merely part of the initial preparation of the Byzantine monk or mystic: they formed the necessary background to the gradual stripping of the soul of sensual - or sensible - desires with the aim of producing catharsis or purification, and then a state of apatheia; bodily virtues are subordinate to virtues of the soul, physical prayer is inferior to mental prayer. The ultimate goal of this kataphatic tradition is the achievement of union with God through a sublime unknowingness. Some of the eastern mystical ideas did, of course reach the west, particularly through the translation of Erigena, to emerge later in the works of such great medieval mystics as Eckhart and Tauler. Some other western developments bear a resemblance to those of Byzantium - Bernard's joyous mysticism is perhaps akin to that of the east. But the complex and metaphysical nature of Byzantine mysticism is not to be found in the Liber de Doctrina, and the value attached to poverty by the Grandmontines and many of the other religious of their era might well have appeared mechanical and inadequate to the Byzantine eye.

Not only is there a gulf between the Liber's and Byzantine traditions of poverty - or, rather, the place in the religious life of poverty - but the existence of this gulf is also revealed by the concentration on the crucifixion which the Liber displays. This theme, which also appears to some extent in the Lives of monastic saints who are Stephen of Muret's contemporaries, is one which would have been largely irrelevant in the Byzantine world¹⁴⁶. Greek theology concentrates not so much on the Christ who suffered and died on the cross but on the Christ of Paul and John, emphasising, as far as it can without falling into monophytism, the God-man rather than the Man-God. Hence the comparative lack of emphasis on the crucifixion in Byzantine churches, where it is presented as one of a number of scenes from the life of Christ, and their elevation of the stern and majestic figure of the Pantocrator. There is no imitatio Christi in the east, no emphasis in monastic or ascetic life on Christ's sufferings for their own sake, whereas in the west in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the vita apostolica, the imitation of the apostles becomes, in cases

such as that of Stephen, an imitation of Christ's suffering which eventually finds its logical outcome in Francis' reception of the stigmata. When Stephen of Muret promised his recruits that in his community they would find only the cross (ie the crucifix) and poverty, he was speaking as a man immersed in the spirit and practise of western Europe and as one to whom the spirituality of the Byzantine world and southern Italy were unknown.

The spirituality of southern Italy is, perhaps, not the easiest entity to define: despite the number of famous and charismatic saints who emerged from the monastic world of southern Italy, the area never produced one of the great works on Byzantine mysticism such as the Spiritual Ladder of John Climacus a product of the spirituality of Sinaite monasticism. Nor, despite some recent and increasingly rigorous investigation on its monastic organisation has there been much done in the way of investigation of the nature of Italo-Greek mysticism and spirituality. Certain general trends, however, do stand out and some observations can be made. It is clear, for instance that the Greek monks of southern Italy and Sicily maintained contact with the monastic life of the rest of the empire and even occasionally with the rulers and aristocrats of that empire¹⁴⁷. One of the most noticeable characteristics of the southern Italian saints of the eighth to the tenth centuries was their mobility, a mobility which has been ascribed to a variety of reasons - Arab incursions, a prolongation of the wanderings caused by the Iconoclast movement, or simply a natural lack of stability in the monastic life of the area¹⁴⁸. Whatever the truth behind their movements, there can be no doubt that before the eleventh century their wanderings often brought them into prolonged contact with other parts of the empire and other monastic centres. Elias the Speleot (864-960) visited the Peloponnese¹⁴⁹; Elias the Younger (823-903) a native of Enna in Sicily visited Jerusalem, the Jordan, mount Tabor, Sinai, Alexandria, Antioch, Africa, the Peloponnese and was eventually summoned to Constantinople by the Emperor Leo VI and died en route at Salonika¹⁵⁰. Fantinus the Younger, a Calabrian, visited the Peloponnese, Athens, Larissa and Salonika in the tenth century¹⁵¹.

Nilus the Younger (d 1004) could, his biographer tells us, have gone to the east when he found his monastery of St Adrian in Calabria threatened by Arab incursions, but chose to go northwards seeking to avoid the consequences of his own fame in the empire¹⁵².

Even in the early twelfth century, when Italo-Greek monasticism has taken on a more settled and more usually cenobitic aspect, St Bartholomew of Simeri visited Constantinople and obtained from the emperor icons, books and fittings for the monastery of the Hodgitria founded by him at Rossano, although the admiral Christodoulos and the Norman queen-regent herself had both made donations to the monastery. Bartholomew also appears to have been connected with the monastery of St Basil 'of the Calabrians' on Athos¹⁵³.

Perhaps even more important is the evidence of southern Italian typika for connections with the empire as a whole and with other Byzantine monastic centres. Pertusi and Minisci have highlighted the relationship between major centres of Byzantine monasticism or landmarks in monastic forms and southern Italian practise: Pertusi believes that the oldest Calabrian and Sicilian typika reflect Studite influence, whereas those of the Otranto region reflect that of Athos¹⁵⁴. On the other hand, some of Pertusi's comments on the imitative development of southern Italian monasticism (he believes that the fragmentation and disruption of monastic life in the major centres of Bythinia was to find its reflection in the appearance of lavrai, skite and hermits in southern Italy with a gradual return to cenobitism in more peaceful times) have been questioned. Even basic definitions such as those of lavra and cenobium are subjects for dispute, and one of the latest views of Italo-Greek monasticism in the ninth and tenth centuries postulates an alternation between various forms of eremiticism and pure cenobitism with an absence of lavra contributing towards a notable tension between the two forms of life¹⁵⁵. Whether one agrees with this interpretation or not, it is undeniable that the careers of Elias the Younger, Elias the Speleot, Fantinus, Nilus the Younger and others demonstrate a marked tendency to oscillation between the founding of cenobia (or at least living in them) and their virtual abandonment in favour of a life of contemplation either in solitude or with one or two disciples. Historians believe, however, that by the eleventh century - possibly the late eleventh century - that this form of life was less common and that the cenobitic life came to predominate. While some questionmarks hang over this viewpoint, it is certainly true that saints' Lives refer to the Rule of Basil and the legislation of Theodore the Studite¹⁵⁶; Pertusi comments, moreover on a ressourcement in the twelfth century when, he maintains, the Rules of Sabas of Jerusalem and

Athanasios of Athos were used as well as those of Basil and Theodore¹⁵⁷.

It is still a matter for debate as to whether or not the Norman policy of centralising Greek monasteries into archimandrites was the decisive factor in this change, or whether the growing emphasis on cenobitism evolved out of other conditions (such as, for example, the freedom from Arab attack)¹⁵⁸. This change could be further investigated, particularly in view of the emergence, in the eleventh century in Asia Minor, of the great Byzantine mystic Symeon the Young (d 1022) who succeeded in reconciling some of the hitherto more exclusively eremitical mystical and contemplative traditions with the cenobitic life. As it is we can only presume with Pertusi:

.....il legittimo sospetto che tra il rinnovato cenobitismo greco della Sicilia e della Calabria e il riformato cenobitismo bizantina studitano e atonita siano esistiti rapporti più o meno stretti di interdipendenza.¹⁵⁹

However, whichever form of Byzantine spirituality found favour in southern Italy and Sicily, whether it was that of John Climacus or that of Symeon himself in the eleventh century and thereafter, there can be little doubt of the essential differences which separated their aims and contemplation from those of Stephen of Muret. The concept of theosis was of central importance to Symeon's scheme and indeed underlay the whole structure of Byzantine spirituality: there is no comprehension of this evident in the thought of the Liber de Doctrina, and when ideas of this sort did reach the west the emphasis on them was necessarily different and there is no suggestion that they reached the west through any other channel than the work of translation of Erigena. The concentration in the Liber on the cross and the sufferings of Christ reflects a concern with Christ's humanity at odds with the Byzantine idea of the God indwelling in man and the eastern monk's potential for achieving unity with God through the stripping away of all inessential concerns and emotions. Similarly, the grim relish with which the conditions of life within Stephen's community are described, the not infrequent references to the prospect of damnation, both countered only by somewhat unconvincing references to the sweetness of divine commands and similar themes are far removed both from Symeon's emphasis on love and the description of the interior joy of Nilus the Younger - degebat itaque vir sanctus quietam et laetam vitam, spiritualis laetitiae plenam¹⁶⁰. While there are occasionally certain powerful reminiscences

of Byzantine mysticism in that of the west, particularly in Bernard's concentration on divine love, we must conclude that these either evolved independently or derived from Erigenan translation of pseudo-Dionysius¹⁶¹. Given the extent and force of its social concerns and the entirely western nature of its theology and spirituality, the Liber de Doctrina itself not only provides extremely powerful evidence that Stephen of Muret was not a disseminator of Byzantine influence in the west but also serves to indicate some of the obstacles which would lie in the way of any such process particularly in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

D Local models for Stephen and Grandmont

Perhaps the most surprising factor in the history of the treatment of the career of Stephen of Muret by experts such as Becquet is to be found not in the lack of attention paid to the often difficult and obscure Liber de Doctrina but in the disregard - in this context - of the vitality of monastic life within the Limousin itself¹⁶². Before going on to discuss the wider implications of the evidence of the Liber for the question of eastern monastic influences on the west in general, it might be appropriate to look briefly at the pays de saints in the period around the lifetime of Stephen. The all too apparent flourishing of communities which were often eremitical in origin and the reputations for sanctity of their founders are highly suggestive where the career of Stephen himself is concerned - even more so as the Limousin evidently enjoyed some religious connections, some made through pilgrimage, some made through other means, with southern Italy.

The Limousin was to produce in the eleventh and twelfth centuries not only a clutch of holy men whose careers often included a retreat from the world and the choice to lead a life which differed from that of conventional Benedictinism but also a number of eremitical foundations which bear some resemblance to Muret and in one or two cases showed the potential for development into small congregations. The most prominent founders in the Limousin - apart from Stephen of Muret - were Geoffrey of Le Chalard (d 1125), Gauthier of L'Esterps (d 1070) Gaucher or Gauthier of Aureil (d ?1140) and Stephen of Obazine (d 1159)¹⁶³. The Life of Geoffrey of Le Chalard should not, perhaps be treated as entirely reliable as it was written partly as an anti-

heretical tract - although it was composed quite shortly after Geoffrey's death¹⁶⁴. A native of the Limousin, Geoffrey is said to have studied at Tours and perhaps elsewhere; he returned to Limoges and was ordained priest in 1086; and the Life tells us that St Hugh of Cluny himself was responsible for encouraging him to lead the monastic life. Geoffrey, however, wishing to avoid the monachalis regulae sarcinam eventually betook himself to the forest and then to a ruined church which had formerly been occupied by the Fleming Robert, himself a hermit. The reconstruction of this church seems to have provoked the wrath of the neighbouring priest and eventually of the church authorities and it has been suggested that it was because of these pressures that Geoffrey was taken under the protection of the bishop of Périgueux and became a canon. Geoffrey accompanied this bishop, Raymond de Thiviers, on the occasion of Urban II's visit to Limoges and also to the council of Poitiers in 1100 - a council which seems to have provided the opportunity for a veritable hermits' convention - but he did not go to the Holy Land with Raymond, spending the rest of his life at his hermitage in the Limousin¹⁶⁵.

In view of the account given in the Life of Stephen of Muret of the ceaseless psalmody of the saint, of his prayers and of his celebration of the office of the Trinity, it is extremely interesting to note Geoffrey's similar concerns and his deathbed injunction to his disciples to value the mass above all else. There is comparatively little evidence for Le Chalard after Geoffrey's death, but we are told that Gaucher of Aureil was present at his funeral. Dereine has suggested that Gaucher may have influenced the customs of Le Chalard in some ways as he was an admirer of Geoffrey's way of life; Becquet rejects this suggestion out of hand, but the idea of contact and cross-fertilisation between Limousin communities and founders is surely a plausible one¹⁶⁶.

One of the first prominent figures in the history of the religious life of the Limousin at this period was Gauthier, abbot of L'Esters, whose Life was composed before 1096 (on the basis of an earlier Life) by Marbod of Rennes¹⁶⁷. Marbod tells us that Gauthier sought not only to avoid the temptations of the flesh but also the contamination of money and avarice; that he was educated; and also that he had been on pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Gauthier initially entered

the religious life at Le Dorat; but after returning from his pilgrimage he was eventually made head of the canonical house of L' Esterps (in 1038?). Once he had become prior - an office which he not only accepted with the greatest reluctance, the Life describes an existence led in the greatest abstinence and humility, stressing his negligence over what he himself ate, his fasts and vigils and his distribution of alms. His patience and fortitude are also stressed: when L' Esterps was burned down in the course of one of the numerous guerres privées which afflicted the Limousin in the eleventh century, he greeted this trial non ad causam desperationis sed ad meritum probationis¹⁶⁸.

Becquet has highlighted the foundation of L' Esterps and its eventual adoption of the Rule of St Augustine as being of profound importance for the establishment and spread of the way of life of the regular canons throughout Aquitaine. He seeks to demonstrate not only the role of bishops and legates in the promotion of this form of life at L' Esterps itself, but also their use of L' Esterps in promoting it elsewhere¹⁶⁹. While this work of underlining the way in which L' Esterps and its daughters gave organisers and reformers to the developing canonical life in Aquitaine is extremely valuable we should not undervalue the importance of Gauthier's own life. Although not a hermit, Gauthier was one of the best-known holy men of the area and was noteworthy not only for the personal sanctity and austerities the memory of which is transmitted by the Life - along with the element of pilgrimage as part of the saint's formation, his noble birth, and his generosity in almsgiving - but also for his association with a form of religious life new to the area.

The third of our notables from the Limousin is Stephen of Obazine, born in the latter part of the eleventh century. His Life tells us that he originally intended to be a priest. Noted for his ragged clothes and rigorous penances, he decided to retreat, with one companion, to the desert: both men gave all their goods to the poor and then put themselves under the direction of a hermit, Bernard de Griffeuille, who already had several disciples and was himself a former disciple of Robert of Chaise-Dieu. After ten months, Stephen and his friend decided that they required an even more quiet and solitary retreat than that of Bernard and they made their way to Obazine (between Brive and Tulle) where they lived in the greatest austerity. However,

they were joined there by increasing numbers and had to build a monastery to shelter these followers who apparently lived a life devoted both to prayer and to manual work¹⁷⁰. The great problem which beset Stephen, from the 1130s into the 1140s was the direction and government of his followers and much of his career as depicted in his Life was apparently devoted to the search for a suitable Rule to follow. Like Stephen of Muret's followers, those of Stephen of Obazine were not, originally, monks as such and only took the religious habit in 1142, following the customs of Dalon (itself founded by Gerald of Salles). Stephen had already applied to the Carthusians for direction and the fifth prior, Guigo, if we are to believe the Life, had counselled him to follow the way of the Cistercians. Whatever the truth of this story, Obazine and its two daughter houses were received into the congregation of Cîteaux in 1147¹⁷¹. Again, despite the different evolution of this little congregation we can see marked similarities between some elements of its early history and the career of its founder and those of Muret and the other Stephen.

The case of Dalon, founded in 1114 by Gerald of Salles, a disciple of Robert of Arbrissel, underlines the connections between the religious life of the Limousin and that of other parts of France. In 1167, when Dalon attached itself to the monastery of Pontigny, it possessed four dependencies within the diocese of Limoges and one just outside its borders¹⁷². But the Limousin, a considerable centre of pilgrimage, was also capable of drawing people from further afield into the network of its religious life. The house (subsequently the head of a congregation) of L' Artige was established by two Venetian pilgrims near Noblat, the site of the shrine of St Leonard; in 1174 the centre of the congregation was moved some miles further away from St Leonard. L' Artige was esteemed by one medieval writer as being, with Grandmont, one of the two original religious creations of the area. Bernard Gui described Mark, who may be considered L' Artige's founder in terms which distinctly recall the Life of Stephen of Muret:

Qui Marchus lorica ferrea indutus die et nocte
ieiuniis, vigiliis, et aliis multis modis corpus
suum cum concupiscentiis crucifixit.¹⁷³

This is, of course, a very late reference and perhaps should not be taken too seriously. Nevertheless, Becquet himself has commented on what he considers to be the marked resemblances between the life of

Grandmont and that of L' Artige. The Artigians were, in fact, canons and unlike the Grandmontines were content to accept churches. All the same, Becquet comments that:

....on retrouve ici et là une certaine égalité entre clercs et laics, l'abstinence, le souci d'isolement, le désappropriation individuelle.(The Artigians) refusaient d' y benir les mariages, et interdisaient aux chapelains seculiers d' y chanter messe a cette occasion: de plus, l' enseignement etait interdit dans leurs maisons.¹⁷⁴

Becquet might also have added that L' Artige maintained an existence as a congregation on a much more restrained and local level than did Grandmont.

The last of the holy men of the Limousin at this period was a native of Meulan in the Vexin, Gaucher of Aureil. His foundation of Aureil, which was to become the centre of a small canonical foundation was built on land belonging to the canons of the chapter of St Stephen's Cathedral at Limoges, the canons retaining the right of confirming the election of the prior of Aureil¹⁷⁵. The Life of Gaucher, in fact, relates that he brought with him to Aureil the customs of the regular canons of St Ruf at Avignon - an assertion which cannot, unfortunately, be confirmed. The earliest record of the customs of Aureil dates from the end of the twelfth century or the beginning of the thirteenth and bears the appearance of an original work owing little to anything save local circumstances, the structure of the community itself, and a general wish to lead a humble, austere and enclosed life¹⁷⁶.

The Life of Gaucher was not composed until the end of the twelfth century and may not be accurate¹⁷⁷; but even if some of its details are suspect, the general picture which it gives is an interesting one. We are told by the Life, for instance, that Gaucher under the influence of a certain Master Humbert, entered his 'desert' of Aureil in 1071 with one companion, having been previously chased off other land in the Limousin. The date of 1071 may be too early: but we know from documentary sources that Gaucher was installed at Aureil by the 1190s. The theme of pilgrimage makes its appearance in the account of Gaucher's youth, and the Life also maintains that Gaucher was given certain powers of absolution by Urban II on his visit to the Limousin when preaching the First Crusade¹⁷⁸. It depicts in Gaucher an austere hermit with a predilection for preaching and an above-average propensity, for

a hermit, for receiving visits from other monastic founders or leaders. The Life cites several names in this connection and has, therefore, been condemned as suspect. However, even if the names which it gives are simply a falsification on the part of the author, hermits did visit each other for various reasons and the general drift of the Life on this topic may be, broadly, correct. (The Life of Stephen of Muret, for instance, records that he travelled through southern France, studying the way of life of monks, canons, or hermits before settling at Muret; the Life of Stephen of Obazine gives similar indications. Hugh of Lacerta did not remain in his cella at La Plaigne but visited Grandmont and Muret. If this theme is a convention or topos, it is a topos which probably enshrines a certain truth.) The names given in the Life of those who were visitors or even pupils of Gaucher are those of Lambert de la Palud, the founder of La Couronne; Stephen, head of an unidentified community of canons regular 'of the forest'; and Stephen of Muret!¹⁷⁹

The evidence of the Life of Gaucher is not perhaps very reliable. It was no doubt convenient for the canons of Aureil to suggest that Stephen of Muret had been the pupil of, or at least advised by, their own founder who was not canonised until 1194. It is likely, however, that Gaucher, who only died in 1140, was younger than Stephen and that he was not, therefore, Stephen's teacher. (We are told, too, that Stephen left Gaucher because the latter admitted women to the religious life - a convenient tale, based on one of the major differences between Grandmont and Aureil?)¹⁸⁰ Yet the prospect of there having been occasional contact between the two men does not seem altogether unlikely given the proximity of Muret and Aureil and the passages in various Lives alluded to above which do indeed suggest that hermits occasionally visited one another, to say nothing of the fact that the only known MS version of the Life of Gaucher is preserved in BN lat 10 891, which also contains the Life, Rule and Liber de Doctrina of Stephen of Muret¹⁸¹. Connections (even if only of an extremely limited nature) between the two cannot be ruled out; and the case of Gaucher only serves once again to underline the number of eremitic vocations in the Limousin in the late eleventh and twelfth centuries and the likelihood of influence by example and imitation.

The existence of Aureil and of its founder Gaucher is of some

significance for the historian struggling to come to terms with the problems presented by the career of Stephen of Muret and the origins of Grandmont: but the foundation of another house - linked both with Aureil and with the Cathedral chapter of St Stephen of Limoges - may well hold the key to our understanding of these problems. Once again, we are dealing with the establishment of a house of regular canons, that of St Barthélemy-de-Bénévent or, as it became known, Bénévent-l'-Abbaye.

The foundation date of this house has been given differently by a number of historians: Bernard Gui was the first to attempt to write a short history of this foundation but is not particularly accurate in his treatment of it and several of his errors have been repeated by others¹⁸². The date is given in Gallia Christiana as c. 1073, but recent commentators have put it nearer 1080¹⁸³. The canons of the cathedral chapter apparently retained their rights over Benevent and the three principal officers of the house (prior, precentor, and sacristan) had to have their election confirmed by the chapter and new canons had to be approved by the chapter in a similar fashion¹⁸⁴.

The foundation-charter also reveals that the house was founded at a place called originally not Benevent but Secondelas or Segundelas (rendered as de Consolas in the Gallia's transcription)¹⁸⁵. The first prior that we know of is Master Humbert - the same Master Humbert who encouraged Gaucher of Aureil to seek out his own desert - and who had, apparently taught in Paris. Humbert was still prior of the house in 1100 and possibly even later than this¹⁸⁶.

Becquet, who has accorded Bénévent-l'-Abbaye a brief treatment in one of his articles, comments on Humbert:

Si l'on repelle le transfert du doyen de Paris Milon sur le siège de Bénévent (1074-5), on est frappé d'apprendre par la Vita de Gaucher d'Aureil qu'Humbert avait enseigné dans la région Parisienne.¹⁸⁷

It is not quite clear what Becquet means to suggest by this; but it is evident, on the other hand, that he does not see the appearance of a second Benevento only a few miles away from Muret and Grandmont as being of primary significance in the history of Grandmont. (The use of the name Bénévent or, in Latin, Beneventum for the house within a few years of its foundation is well-attested by the surviving documents: the initially startling usage ecclesia Beneventana is common as is the

formula ecclesia Sancti Bartholomaei in loco qui Beneventum nominatur¹⁸⁸. The original name of Segundelas fell out of use very quickly). Nor does he see as significant the origins of the name of St Bartholomew of Benevento by which the church was known: it derives from the possession by the canons, at some point soon after the foundation of the church of relics of the saint brought (by what means we are not, unfortunately, told) from Benevento in southern Italy.

The presence of Beneventan relics in northern Europe is not unheard of in the eleventh century: the Historia Novorum of Eadmer relates that in the 1030s a bishop of Benevento, in an attempt to raise money for the relief of a famine, took an arm of St Bartholomew and offered it for sale to Emma, wife of King Canute of England. The arm became part of the relic-collection of Canterbury Cathedral, and Eadmer claims that the robes of the Archbishop of Benevento, given in return for the arm, were more splendid than those of any other prelate at the Council of Bari in 1098¹⁸⁹. Whether or not the city and cathedral of Benevento still in reality possessed the relics by the eleventh century is, however, a matter for some doubt as the Monte Cassino Chronicle relates a peculiar tale concerning the emperor Otto III and the city of Benevento: Otto, apparently begged the body of the apostle, but the Beneventans succeeded in passing off the corpse of Paulinus of Nola in its place!¹⁹⁰ Whatever the truth of this, the Beneventans certainly believed, or wished the world to believe, that they still possessed the body of Bartholomew, and there is nothing unusual in the dedication of a church following the acquisition of relics.

It is surely more than coincidence that another Benevento was established in the Limousin in the same decade that Stephen of Muret is alleged to have settled on his hill at Muret. The remains of the cartulary of Bénévent-l'-Abbaye afford no trace of the presence of Stephen of Muret in the latter part of the eleventh century and the early part of the twelfth. It is, on the other hand, perhaps significant that the Life of Gaucher of Aureil the nearest hermit, topographically speaking, to Stephen claims some connection between him and Master Humbert, the founder of Bénévent-l'-abbaye¹⁹¹. Even if Stephen never actually visited the house, it is unlikely that either he or his biographer were completely unaware of its existence; and it is just possible that it was through the existence of Bénévent that

the idea was conceived of the tale of Stephen's visit to southern Italy. One small but significant detail, however, suggests the possibility of a more positive connection between Benevent and Muret: the former was a canonical house and Grandmont followed a canonical liturgy¹⁹².

Could Bénévent also have provided the medium through which information about Milo of Benevento was gleaned in Benevento itself from the Annales Beneventani or the Liber Praeceptorum? This may not have been necessary, given that the popes often spent time in Benevento and that a Grandmontine visitor to the papal court there seeking Stephen's canonisation could easily have made it his business to find out any records of the archbishops of Benevento c 1070-80. Against this idea, however, must be set the impression that what we know of the moves made towards obtaining Stephen's canonisation reflects the work of intermediaries such as the bishops du Cher of Limoges and Cahors and of papal legates, although this is not necessarily the whole story¹⁹³. It must be said, though, that it is extremely difficult to give a precise answer to the question of how knowledge of Milo reached the writer of Stephen's Life, especially as even the Beneventan sources on him are so brief and vague. The heretical thought does occur that, given the later dating of Vat Lat 4939, the Beneventan sources might just have gleaned their knowledge of Milo from the Life of Stephen whenever it was initially submitted towards obtaining his canonisation..... This is pure speculation, but there were a few other known contacts between the Limousin and southern Italy which have gone unremarked in this context. The Limousin was an area visited by pilgrims, particularly those heading towards Santiago de Compostella in Spain, and both the ancient shrine of St Leonard at Noblat near Limoges and Limoges itself were recommended as stopping-places by the twelfth-century guide for pilgrims to Santiago¹⁹⁴.

The recommendation of the shrine of St Leonard reflects the popularity and spread of this cult from the tenth and eleventh centuries onwards. The exact circumstances of the foundation of the house of St Leonard at Siponto, with which we dealt in Part Two, are not known. The first document in the cartulary dates from 1113 and the house was probably founded nearer the beginning of the century; however, a privilege issued by Innocent II in 1137 indicates that its inhabitants followed the Rule of St Augustine - like those of St Leonard of Noblat

which had gone over to being a house of regular canons c 1100-05¹⁹⁵. The connection between the two houses may be found in the presence in the Limousin of Bohemond of Taranto who had come to the shrine at Noblat in 1106 to give thanks for his safe deliverance from the Turks¹⁹⁶. Not only did the house at Siponto appear around the time of his visit, but the cult of St Leonard spread even further with the appearance of two churches dedicated to him in Sicily in the first half of the twelfth century¹⁹⁷. More tantalising still is the unexplained existence of a Mont Gargan near Limoges - a French Monte Gargano?¹⁹⁸ We shall probably never be able to answer that question; but two important factors do emerge with reasonable clarity from this discussion. The first is that there was a wealth of experience and example for Stephen of Muret to draw on in his pursuit of the religious life within the Limousin itself: both his career and the development of Grandmont reflect similarities to this local - and vital - movement. The second is that there were connections between the religious life of the Limousin and that of southern Italy - but connections focusing on pilgrimage, relics and the cult of saints, all three characteristic and ultimately much more credible and comprehensible manifestations of twelfth-century piety and religious experience than any alleged borrowing from the Byzantine monasticism of southern Italy.

On the basis of some of these genuine connections the story of Stephen's journey to Benevento was somehow erected; and although the means by which this was done are still not entirely clear - and indeed may never be so - this level of local evidence provides further proof of the unreliability of the Life of Stephen.

E Conclusion

The Life of Stephen of Muret has been regarded up to now as the best documented - in the sense of the most circumstantial - case which, or so it was thought, illustrated eastern 'influence' on the origins and development of the 'new' orders of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Whatever doubts had been expressed about its reliability, it had recently been enshrined in a magisterial new edition accompanied by a series of learned articles in which Dom Becquet apparently vindicated its central premises with their account of Stephen's journey to southern Italy as a child and his education at the hands of an archbishop who

brought him up to admire a Calabrian community which lived without either money or possessions, having everything in common. Were Becquet's material as easily verifiable as he believes it is, there would indeed be some degree of justification for the widely-accepted view that there is a degree of 'eastern' influence on at least one order, lending some positive backing to what had often been a fairly generally accepted, if somewhat vaguely conceived and expressed notion.

As it is, an examination of the evidence of the Life, together with that of the 'dossier' on Milo of Benevento and the Liber de Doctrina demonstrates not any dubious and distant influence but the strength of Grandmontine connections with the society and monastic movement which surrounded it. It also suggests that, far from there being some community of ideas between eastern and western monasticism, the separate evolution of spirituality and theology had erected a barrier between the two sides - particularly in the eleventh and twelfth centuries when western spirituality appears to be turning towards the vision of a more human Christ. All this, in turn, raises the question of the way in which historians have handled the question of connections and comparisons between eastern and western monasticism and whether there was ever any real possibility of fruitful contact between the two sides. The subject is a vast one and we can do little more than suggest a framework for discussion: nevertheless, the implications of this re-evaluation of the Life of Stephen cannot be ignored.

Comparisons of eastern and western monasticism, at least when made by western historians, are often - although not invariably - made in favour of the west. The barren categorising and obvious prejudices of an earlier generation of historians has done much to blight any serious comparative study of Byzantine and western monasticism. In 1881, Harnack characterised eastern monasticism as 'a monasticism of barren asceticism without a history'¹⁹⁹. In 1978, Beck could still write:

Stellt man aber ein Vergleich mit dem mittelalterlichen Westen an, so kann man sich des Eindrucks nicht erwehren dass dort Lebensgestaltung, Bildung, Architektur, Kunst und Gewerbe stärker und stilbildender von den Mönchen beeinflusst sind als in Osten. Zentren wie Corbie oder Fulda oder gar Cluny hat Byzanz nie Ähnliches entgegenzustellen.²⁰⁰

Beck attempts to explain this by a survey of the historical development

of eastern monasticism, but the reader is still left with the impression that his attitude towards the Byzantine monk is, like that of many other historians, one of puzzlement and, fundamentally, one of distaste.

Other historians, eager to find connections between east and west leap into exercises of categorisation which are little more helpful. For some, such as Knowles and Mahn, the east equals eremiticism - and any new eremitical movements may therefore be connected with the east. This produces notable confusions in Mahn who, although he considers that many of the eremitical creations of the eleventh and twelfth centuries originated spontaneously, nevertheless makes much of the example of St Nilus and of an Armenian, Symeon, who 'parcourut l' Italie a la fin du Xème siècle'²⁰¹. Far from being exclusively eremitic in character, Byzantine monasticism cherished a strong cenobitic tradition nourished not only by Basil but also by Theodore of Stoudion and even by the work of Symeon the New Theologian in the eleventh century and southern Italy, at the period when Stephen is supposed to have visited it, was undergoing something of a cenobitic revival. Conversely, although the undisciplined monastic life was frowned upon by Benedict - and this may possibly have cast something of a shadow over eremitic life in the west - he could still recommend the eremitical state for those sufficiently strengthened and prepared by life in the cenobium²⁰².

The extent of eremitic life in the west before the great revival of the eleventh century needs to be further investigated, but it was not unknown for Cluniacs to go into retreat, and the lives of eremitical saints of this period sometimes reveal the existence of earlier hermits on sites which they came to occupy²⁰³. One is led to suspect that the number of unremarked solitaries living in western Europe before the apparent boom may have been higher than is traditionally supposed; and it must also be said that no-one has suggested that hermits such as Christina of Markyate or Godric of Finchale in England owed their inspiration to anything other than the religious and social conditions of their own country and area²⁰⁴. The equation of eremiticism with the east is essentially a simplistic one which, taken to its logical conclusion, allows for no development within Byzantine or western monasticism and society. Attempts to contrast eastern and western monasticism solely on organisational grounds and to claim that new developments depend on borrowings rather than evolution must ultimately fail.

The same caveats might apply to the equation of austerity with the Rule of Basil which is, in reality rather more balanced and moderate than some historians would seem to realise. For them, Basil stands for the east - in a vague conflation and confusion of a number of eastern traditions including those of the desert fathers²⁰⁵. The process of associating austerity with the desert fathers and therefore with some notion of the east and the Byzantine empire is not a new one: it began at a comparatively early period. Hence, in the twelfth century, William of St Thierry, writing to the Carthusians of Mont-Dieu could praise their way of life in terms of:

implanting in the shadows of the west and the cold
of Gaul the light of the east and the ancient fervour
of the religious life of Egypt.²⁰⁶

A great deal has since been read into this expression of William's: but stripped of the connotations with which it has been invested it suggests nothing more than a compliment paid in fairly general terms by a man who has some knowledge of monastic origins and perhaps of the theology of the east. On another level, but demonstrating a similar pattern, we might take the references to the 'hermits of Calabria' in the Life of Stephen. The phrase 'hermits of Calabria' occurs not in the original text itself but in one of the added chapter-headings; the text itself refers to a 'certain congregation' which it describes in the following terms:

Corporalis autem subsidii sollicitudinem solummodo
in Deum proiecerant, unanimiter in clauastro viventes
et oboedientiam humani generis reparatricem pro suis
viribus in omnibus custodientes. Et quia mundum sibi
et se mundo crucifixerant, et in cruce Christi gloria-
bantur.....²⁰⁷

There is nothing here which would serve to indicate beyond doubt connections with Greco-Italian monasticism and much which indicates the western background and conceptions of the writer. Western notions of the forms which the former took must have been extremely vague, to say the least, if this is the best which the Grandmontines (who had after all something at stake in the telling of this story) could do.

Given the vagueness of such references - coupled with the testimony of the Liber de Doctrina - it seems pertinent not to attempt, as others have done to seek out examples of 'influence', but to turn current assumptions on their head and to ask what degree of real

understanding of eastern monasticism could have existed in the west at any period. This, of course, is an enormous question and a careful analysis of all the evidence might well indicate considerable variations in the degree of understanding which could have been achieved: the spirituality which developed in the west in the eleventh and twelfth centuries - and of which Stephen of Muret is in his own way a representative - may have presented a particular barrier which had not existed at an earlier period. On the other hand, some of the evidence which has been used to demonstrate eastern influence is highly suggestive and deserves to be mentioned. We might take, for instance, the well-known instance of the visit of Nilus to Monte Cassino in the tenth century. Hamilton and McNulty have dealt with this particular subject at some length:

The Cassinese community first became familiar with Greek monastic traditions when St Nilus came to live at Valleluce on the estates of the monastery in the reign of Abbot Aligernus (ob. 984). Aligernus asked Nilus and his companions to sing the Divine Office in Greek at Cassino and the saint wrote a Greek hymn in honour of St Benedict. When the Office was ended, St Nilus held a conference with the Latin community at which some of the differences between Greek and Latin observance were discussed.

..... St Nilus left Valleluce for Serperi near Gaeta during Manso's reign because he feared that the laxity of Cassinese observance would have a deleterious effect on his own community. But while he was living at Valleluce, St Nilus had succeeded in creating among the Cassinese community an awareness of the spirituality of the Christian east.....²⁰⁸

This, the authors assert, was to influence Monte Cassino even after the departure of Nilus for Serperi: the future abbot John III, apparently disquieted by the 'princely ways' of Aligernus's successor Manso, went on pilgrimage to Jerusalem, Sinai, and Athos²⁰⁹.

The authors' association of the pilgrimage made by John to the east with Nilus' visit rests upon extremely shaky ground, the more so as they also assert that John was disquieted with the rule of Manso. But even the visit itself is not quite evidence of the kind of 'influence' which Hamilton and McNulty seem to imagine. Nilus decided to go to Campania when his monastery of St Adrian (near St Demetrio Corone in Calabria) was menaced by Arab attacks in or about 980²¹⁰. The account of his visit to the great Benedictine house has not survived in any Cassinese account - this would appear to be for political

reasons, but says something about the preservation of the memory at Monte Cassino itself - but is given in the Life of Nilus, written by one of his disciples. (The value of eyewitness testimony is therefore balanced out by the obvious devotion of the writer for his master)²¹¹.

The account of Nilus' visit given by Hamilton and McNulty is, naturally, correct in substance. Aligernus, who had himself restored Monte Cassino after a Saracen attack, approximately thirty years earlier, was willing to give Nilus and his companions shelter at Valleluce on the monastery's possessions at the suggestion of Pandulf of Capua, who appears, despite the exigencies of his political position, to have had a genuine regard for Nilus²¹². It is indeed true that Nilus was received with great honour and considerable ceremony by the monastery and that he composed a Greek hymn in honour of St Benedict: this latter work (or, rather, these latter works) were of considerable complexity and were designed to accord considerable honour, along Byzantine lines, to the western saint. The charismatic character of Benedict is stressed, following the emphases of Gregory the Great's account of Benedict in Dialogues, II (translated into Greek by pope Zacharias). But the significant point in their account is surely that Nilus held a conference in which some of the differences between Greek and Latin practices were to emerge. The Cassinese monks asked, for example, for a definition of the proper work of the monk (ton ergon tou monachou) and Nilus replied with an ancient definition of the monk as an angel - his angelic work was the practise of charity towards others and the duty of praising God. This, as a recent commentator has remarked, is a reference to the chapter of pseudo-Dionysius which describes the inferior angel being aided by the superior, and man being aided by the angel. And other un-western or comparatively unfamiliar ideas appear here - for instance that of the man who cherishes hate within his heart and becomes a demon. Later a monk asked Nilus what would happen if, having abstained from meat, he then ate it once a year. Nilus's severe reply has been taken to indicate the greater rigidity of the east on this matter. The Latin practise of fasting on the Saturday - although by no means reprovved by Nilus, who was evidently determined to maintain a conciliatory line here - emerges as a possible point of contention in less happy circumstances, for Nilus declares that the Greeks do not fast on the Saturday because the manichaeans (Paulicians?) reject the Old Testament - heretically - and mourn on the day of the

Jewish sabbath²¹³.

The nature of the conference - and the fact that it was held at all - demonstrate the nature of the gulf which existed between Latin and Greek monasticism. It was not a gulf which would lead to marked hostility in itself, but it consisted of subtle but important theological differences of practice sufficiently marked to ensure separate - if amicable - development. And the same could be said of some of the other apparent instances of eastern 'influence' presented by Hamilton and McNulty. The monastery of St Alessio in Rome, for instance, was inhabited by a dual congregation of Latin and Greek monks in the tenth century: but the two congregations, though recognising one head, each maintained their own rites and lived separately²¹⁴. As for the cases which our authors cite of individual Greek monks being received with favour and marks of esteem in the west it need hardly be said that none of these actually demonstrate 'influence' in the sense of a force for change: once more, we are dealing with instances - and not many, at that - of westerners admiring and venerating undoubtedly charismatic Greek holy men - but that is all. (That Otto III was among these admirers is hardly surprising either - Hamilton and McNulty themselves indicate to some extent the important role played in this by his Greek mother.)

Even when occasional contact such as that described by Hamilton and McNulty did take place, it is quite possible that the admiration which westerners were capable of feeling for Greek monks involved a similar degree of incomprehension to that displayed by the Grandmontines who chose to stress that their Calabrian hermits had neither money nor possessions, emphasising that Archbishop Milo's sermons to the populace dwelt on their lack of cupidity, and investing them with the penitential spirituality of Grandmont itself. Calabrian congregations could, it appears, be painted in a style based on Grandmont without any evident sense of incongruity. And even when there was a desire to understand Greek spirituality in addition to simple contact, there could exist a degree of bewilderment on the part of westerners only capable of interpreting this spirituality, initially, in their own terms. The famous Ritmo Cassinese, composed in southern Italy (probably in Monte Cassino itself) at the end of the twelfth or the beginning of the thirteenth century reveals a great admiration for the Byzantine spiritual tradition, but the anonymous author

depicts admirably some of the difficulties involved in coming to terms with it²¹⁵. It should be said that one commentator has seen in this poem reminiscences of Nilus's visit to Monte Cassino, and, given a certain community of themes, he may be correct - in which case the poem is the only Cassinese record of the great monastic leader's visit. If this interpretation is correct, it shows that the passage of time had not made Nilus's injunctions and teaching any the easier to comprehend, although the poet is evidently much impressed by them. Nevertheless, he presents them in the form of a dialogue between a man from the east (unu magnu vir prudente) and one from the west, who meet at dawn and begin to discuss the spiritual life. The easterner exhorts his companion to be joyful; he has already aroused his interest by saying that he comes from a world where he has found great happiness:

Frate meu, de quillu mundu bengò
loco sejo et ibi me combengo.²¹⁶

The westerner is much impressed and asks what is eaten and drunk in this world:

Que bibande mandicate?
Abete bibande cusci amorose
como queste nostre saporose?²¹⁷

The sage from the east is horrified by the gross nature of this response:

Ei, parabola dissensata!
quantu male fu i trobate!
Obebelli ai manducata
tia bibanda scelerata?
Obe l'ai assimilata?
Biband' abemo purgata,
d' ab enitiu preparata:
perfecta binja plantata
de tuttu tempu fructata.....²¹⁸

The westerner is so impressed by the saintly asceticism of the speaker that he concludes that he and his like are not men, but angels from heaven (Angeli de celu sete!)²¹⁹

If this poem is, as the last quotation in particular suggests, a reminiscence of Nilus' colloquy with the monks of Monte Cassino then it provides us with a delightful illustration of the way in which the eastern mystical tradition could still be approached in more earthly and basic ways in the west: even if the poet himself possibly has a greater understanding than his western creation, he is nevertheless using the device of dialogue to lead his western audience to some level of comprehension.²²⁰ And, once again, we find the essence of Greek

mysticism reduced to the business of abstinence from food and drink - because of this the easterner and his like are elevated to the status of angels. We seem to be dealing here with a case of limited perception, made through reference to a more familiar cultural framework.

This conclusion may well stand for the whole question of eastern 'influence' on western monasticism: what in the final analysis could the two groups be expected to understand of each other? The question of 'influence', even when it does not involve unreliable cases such as Stephen's, rests on certain unattractive assumptions. The first of these is possibly an unconscious postulation of Byzantine cultural superiority and the peculiar view of cultural transmission so deplored, in a rather different context, by Brown: there is, he affirms, a tendency to treat the east as:

a distinct and enclosed reservoir of superior culture from which the occasional stream is released to pour downhill - by some obscure law of cultural hydraulics - to water the lower reaches of the west.²²¹

The assumption of eastern 'influence' would seem to me to rest on even more questionable premises than this, as it detaches monasticism in both east and west from any social context whatsoever - in addition to treating it as an unchanged and unchanging institution. While Byzantine and western monks could claim a common (and distinct) spiritual ancestry in the deserts of Egypt, and while certain monastic institutions are bound to retain certain similarities, other factors intervene, by the eleventh century, to create a distancing between the two sides. We are not dealing here with a model of deep alienation but one of a subtle drawing apart. Greek and Latin monks - to state the obvious - literally spoke a different language; they dressed differently; and to a certain extent, they ate - and fasted - differently. Liturgies differed from area to area; monastic organisation underwent reform and change in different ways and at different times in east and west. And, perhaps most important of all, the theology and practice of the Greek and Latin churches set up a barrier between their monks.

There seems to be an underlying tendency amongst historians to extrapolate from the evidence of good relations between Greeks and Latins on a basic level even in times of crisis a mistaken view that, although popes and patriarchs might disagree, monks could still live in

harmony. This is a dangerous point of view, because it makes us forget that monks, by the very nature of their calling virtually live the spiritual differences between east and west, although they might not come to blows about them. It is not only the case of St Nilus which comes to mind here: we might also consider that the hagiographer of the great mystical theologian, Symeon the Young, was the monk Stethatus, who was to play such a prominent role in the schism of 1054²²². The contemplation of the Byzantine monk rested, after all, on the idea of theosis: and it remains true that even the aspects of twelfth century western spirituality which bear most superficial reference to that of Byzantium - the mysticism of Bernard or of the Carthusians - ultimately retains a devotion to the humanity of Christ not present in the east. What real understanding should we expect between the two monastic worlds?

It might, of course, be argued against this that the Normans of southern Italy and Sicily managed to absorb Greek monasticism into their state and that they therefore showed some understanding of it. But the Normans were colonists par excellence: as their art and administrative practices demonstrate, they were capable of using any institution or group to make their own rule easier or more prestigious. They did not necessarily understand Greek monasticism; and once effectively deprived of any form of political, institutional and administrative contact with the empire, it began to die a lingering death. The fate of Greek monasticism in southern Italy powerfully suggests that we cannot divorce monasticism from the society in which it develops - and this is where, I would contend, the 'influence' view of monasticism must fail. An extraneous influence can only succeed in a society or organisation which is ripe for its reception and, if this society is ready, the influence itself becomes paradoxically of little real importance.

The Liber de Doctrina demonstrates powerfully - if crudely - the close interaction between society, spirituality and the monk in western Europe in the twelfth century and it is on this level, I would suggest, that further investigation should continue. While monastic organisation is much studied, as is monastic poverty in relation to the society of the time, the associated questions concerning spirituality theology and mysticism often tend to be dealt with in separate

compartments & yet these are intimately connected to the former and may well help us to arrive at a more perfect understanding of monastic developments in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. It is certainly only through a closer examination of spirituality that any real comparison of Byzantine and western monasticism can be made. As for the question of eastern influence on the 'new' orders of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the case of Stephen of Muret demonstrates much the same result that at least one historian has found when investigating the wider question of cultural relations between the two sides - that both were firmly entrenched in their own societies and assumptions and that, in the last analysis, each had little or nothing to say to the other²²³.

Notes Part III

1. Life, c XXXVIII Scriptores 3 pp 127-8.
2. *ibid.* Becquet, 'La règle' p 10. The term monachi sancti Augustini suggests that the monks involved were not, in fact, based at Ambazac but were those of S Augustin-lès-Limoges - see GC II cols 572-80 and Bernard Gui in Labbé, Bibliotheca Nova II pp 275-350. The only monastery in Ambazac itself was the old Benedictine house of St Antony, about which it is difficult to find any information.
3. Life of Hugh of Lacerta c 49 and Vita Ampliata of Stephen LXXIV, Scriptores p 202 and 158-60.
4. Rule, Scriptores 2 c XXIV p 82 and Liber de Doctrina, Scriptores I Conclusio, p 61. Life c CXL Scriptores pp 128-9.
5. Grandmont, comm. Saint-Silvestre, cant. Laurière, arrond. Limoges, Haute-Vienne.
6. J-R Gaborit, L' Architecture de l' Ordre de Grandmont, unpublished thesis, Paris, 1963 p 65.
7. For the wood at Muret, see A. Lecler, 'Histoire de l' Abbaye de Grandmont' BSAHL LVII (1907) p 138. I would like to be able to confirm this from records, but have not been able to do so. In the Archives of the Departement of Haute-Vienne, section H, there are 189 items concerning the Order of Grandmont. These were provisionally numbered in the late nineteenth or early twentieth century by the historian Guibert: this provisional numbering has not, apparently, been conserved. The director of the Archives, M. Decanter, did not allow me access to these documents, and said that there was nothing of any interest in them to anyone studying the origins of Grandmont. These documents are under his personal care and could only, in any case be examined by a process of random selection. Dom Becquet himself does not appear to have used any of this series; and E. Hallam, in her article, 'Henry II, Richard I and the Order of Grandmont', Journal of Medieval History I (1975) pp 165-186 makes no reference to the documents in question. On the other hand, Gaborit, L' Architecture, refers to some of them, notably when describing the situation of Grandmont, pp 55 ff.

8. L. Guibert, La Destruction de l' Ordre de Grandmont (Limoges, 1877).
9. Becquet, 'La Règle' p 31.
10. See Knowles and Hadcock, Medieval Religious Houses in England and France (London, 1953) p 103. The houses were those of Alderbury (Salop), Craswall (Hereford), and Grosmont (Yorks) - the Trinity College manuscript of the Life of Stephen comes from this last house.
11. Hallam, 'Henry II' p 167.
12. See notes 8 and 9 above and also J. Becquet, 'L' éremitisme clerical et laic dans l' ouest de France', L' Eremitismo pp 188-211, esp pp 202-3.
13. Life of Hugh of Lacerta, Scriptores p 204.
14. For Geoffrey Babion, see J-B Bonnes 'Un des plus grand des prédicateurs du XII siècle, Geoffroy de Loroux', RB XLVI (1945) pp 190-200. For the question in general, see Becquet 'La Règle' pp 52-3.
15. See in particular, Hallam 'Henry II' pp 166-7. For the sale of La Marche, see Gillingham, Richard the Lionheart (London, 1978) p 78: Henry apparently struck a bargain very favourable to himself, obtaining the county for half its estimated value.
16. See Hallam 'Henry II' passim.
17. Quoted *ibid* p 173.
18. *ibid* pp 175 ff.
19. L. Delisle, 'Examen de treize chartes de l'Ordre de Grandmont', Mémoires de la Société des Antiquaires de Normandie, XX (Caen, 1854) pp 171-221; J. Becquet, 'La bullaire de Grandmont', RM XLVI (1956) pp 50-1 and 51-2, although he rejects not only the supposed bull of Gregory VII but also one of Urban II - see pp 39-49.
20. See Delisle, 'Examen' pp 189-90.
21. See the version given in PL 202 cols 1416-8, esp col 1417:
 post confirmationem felicis recordationis Adriani pape
 predecessoris nostri salubriter addidistis.....

22. Or, of course, Urban III could be repeating Alexander:

omnibus regulam vestram servantibus, sicut in vestro ordine, et suprapositis nostrae correctionis capitulis continetur, laborem loco penitentiae, et in peccatorum suorum remissionem injungimus, quem in ipsa observantia patiuntur.....

but the bull of Alexander III is extremely brief and although Becquet ('Bullaire de Grandmont' no 31) writes that the original is conserved in the Departmental Archives of Maine-et-Loire, it would perhaps be helpful to see this original. Hallam, 'Henry II' pp 172-3 certainly makes a good point when she says that the subject-matter of these bulls is 'exhortatory and not legal', and suggests that the relaxation of the Grandmontine prohibition against holding charters may have begun this way. Becquet, 'La première crise' p 315 makes an extremely helpful distinction between Hadrian IV's use of conversatio and Lucius III's of ordo - but this still leaves unexplained Alexander III's reference to the recognition of a Rule by Hadrian IV.

23. See Delisle, 'Examen' pp 189-90.

24. PL 202 col 1417.

25. See J-B Mahn, L' Ordre Cistercien pp 141-2.

26. See the version in PL 204 cols 1376-7:

Ne igitur de regula vestra in posterum questio referatur, quam bonae memoriae Urbanus predecessor noster de consilio et assensu cardinalium et multorum episcoporum Italiae, praesentibus exvobis tam clericis quam conversis, ab eius firmitatem et perpetuam pacem per osculum pacis assensum praebentibus, noscitur corexisse, ut in eiusdem privilegio et in ipso plenius continetur, eam sub sigillo in praesentibus scriptis de verbo ad verbum duximus inserendam, quae talis est: 'Quisquis hanc religionem et, usque salvus erit, amen'. Ut autem predicta Regula perpetuis temporibus illibata consistat, ipsam prout ab eodem Urbano praedecessore nostro, ut superius diximus correctae est, auctoritate apostolica confirmamus.....

Urban III was elected pope in 1185 but died in 1187, and his successor, Gregory VIII - a native of Benevento - only ruled for 57 days. It seems as if the Grandmontine case for the recognition of the Rule and perhaps for the canonisation of Stephen had been

delayed by the brevity of these two papal reigns as well as by the upheavals caused by the schism in the order to which Clement III refers, PL 204 cols 1375-6.

27. Fliche and Rousset de Pina in Histoire de l' Eglise vols 8 and 9, pp 241 and 466 respectively, both stress that the Life was written with a view to obtaining canonisation - but this was before Becquet's discovery of the Vita A and it is necessary to take Becquet's discovery into account before either concurring or disagreeing with their verdict.
28. To take three examples, Vitalis of Savigny, d 1122 - Life after 1170; Gerald of La Sauve Majeure, d 1095 - Life 1140-90; Gaucher of Aureil, d c 1140 - Life late twelfth century.
29. Becquet, 'Les premiers écrivains' pp 127-30.
30. Life of Hugh c 50, Scriptores p 204.
31. Life, Scriptores 3, chapters XXXVIII - XLIII (Explicit vita beati Stephani Muretensis), chapters XLIV - XLVII.
32. The Cambridge MS, Trinity 1222 (0.3.50) gives no chapter headings, whereas the Paris MS BN lat 10. 891 gives the chapter headings reproduced by Becquet but as marginal notes at the beginning of chapters.
33. See Scriptores 3, where the miracles of the Cambridge manuscript occupy Chapters XXXIV, XXV, XXVI, XLII, XLIII; the Paris miracles in chapters XLIV - XLVIII; Vita Ampliata LVII - LXXIII.
34. Scriptores 3, Vita Ampliata LVII - LXXIII. Stephen as sanctus occurs in chapter LVII, but when he is being called upon for help and also in chapter LXIV.
35. By the device of the Vita Ampliata, published as an appendix to the Vitae A and B.
36. This, with the omission of the names of the cardinals involved, is the central section of the bull as given in AASS February II col 204: it differs slightly from that given in PL 204 cols 1426-7.

37. Becquet, 'Saint Etienne' p 409. Becquet does not say which Life but it is, in fact, from the Exordium Magnum PL 185 cols 447-8.
38. See Martène and Durand, VSA C VI preface lxiii-xlv.
39. Scriptores 3 pp 105-13.
40. *ibid* pp 113-6.
41. *ibid* pp 116-8.
42. *ibid* pp 118-9.
43. *ibid* pp 120-1.
44. *ibid* pp 121-4.
45. *ibid* pp 124-37. The references to Tours and Vézelay in the miracle which follows Stephen's death (chapter XXXV, p 126) must in part reflect the position of Muret near major pilgrimage routes.
46. Th. Schieffer, Die Päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich (Berlin, 1935) pp 214-7.
47. Scriptores 3 pp 115-8.
48. *ibid* XIX p 115.
49. Becquet, 'La Règle' p 19 n 2 comments on Stephen's diet which was meatless, as was that of Gaucher of Aureil and Stephen of Obazine, but the Rule of St Benedict, chapter 39, also forbids meat except for the sick.
50. Becquet, 'Saint Etienne' pp 408-9; for the oath, see Scriptores 3 p 112.
51. The Lives of Robert of Arbrissel, PL 162 cols 1043-58; Robert of Chaise-Dieu, PL 171 cols 1515-32; Bernard of Tiron, PL 172 cols 1363-1446; William Firmat, AASS April III cols 336-43; and see also for local saints whose careers resembled that of Stephen, Part III section D below.
52. See the very brief chapter XXXI of the Life, Scriptores 3 p 117.

53. *ibid* chapter XXIII p 117.
54. *ibid* chapter XXII pp 116-7.
55. See note 51 above.
56. Life chapter XXIII, Scriptores 3 p 117.
57. For Stephen of St Geneviève, see Dictionnaire de Droit Canonique, vol V cols 487-92.
58. See Becquet, 'La première crise' pp 296-7. The calendar is preserved in the Archives Départementales of Haute-Vienne, I 167 (Sém. 77).
59. Becquet, 'La crise' pp 296-7.
60. Multis modis, Scriptores 1 pp 60-2; Vita Ampliata chapter XXXIV Scriptores 3 p 141.
61. There is no reference to Stephen in any of the papal documents before his canonisation and no reference even to a founder of Grandmont. This did not happen in the cases of other large orders - to take only two examples - Lucius II's privilege for the Praemonstratensians at PL 201 cols 1238 ff, which names Norbert and that of Urban III for the Vallumbrosans at PL 202 cols 1413-5 which refers to quote John Gualbert. Stephen's case appears to be an exception to the usual rule.
62. See E. W. Kemp, 'Pope Alexander III and the canonisation of saints' Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 4th series, XXVII. (1945) and above, Part One, pp 21-3.
63. J. C. Robertson, ed, Materials for the history of Archbishop Thomas Becket vol 7 (London, 1885) Rolls Series, p 449. See also Robertson, Materials 6 (1882) for John of Salisbury's speculations on the possible position of the Grandmontines with regard to Becket.
64. A conclusion strongly suggested by Life chapter XXIII, Scriptores 3 p 117. cf note 53 above.
65. See Becquet, 'Les premiers écrivains' pp 122-32. In Paris, BN lat

10. 891, the Liber occupies ff 30v - 78v; there is another MS version in BN lat 13. 771 ff 1-25.
66. Becquet, 'Les premiers écrivains' pp 128-9 and p 129.
67. Scriptores 1 p 4; Becquet, 'Les premiers écrivains' pp 131-2.
68. Becquet, 'Les premiers écrivains' p 132.
69. For this observation, I am indebted to the vigilance of Giles Constable, Monastic Tithes p 221-2 who calls the passages in Multis modis 'remarkably similar'. Cf Corpus Christianorum 103 pp 145 and 148 (sermons XXXIII 2 and XXXIV 3).
70. See not only Becquet, 'La première crise', but also Becquet, 'L' "institution", premier coutumier de l' Ordre de Grandmont' BSAHL XLVI (1956) pp 15-32.
71. See note 68 above.
72. Becquet, 'Les premiers écrivains' p 132, note 27.
73. *ibid.*
74. Liber, Prologue, Scriptores 1 p 5.
75. *ibid.*
76. *ibid.* See also the prologue to the Rule, Scriptores 3 p 66:
 Although different fathers have commended various ways of life in the writings which we call the Rule of St Basil, the Rule of St Augustine, the Rule of St Benedict, they are not the origins of religion but its extensions, not its root but its branches. For there is one first and principal rule of rules for faith and salvation, from which all others derive, as streams from a single source, namely the holy Gospel, given to the saviour to the apostles and faithfully preached by them throughout the world.
- Here we have an example of stress being placed on the aspect of apostolic preaching, although the Liber elsewhere lays particular stress on poverty in the religious life. See Part I p 28 and note 81, above.
77. Liber, conclusion, Scriptores 1 p 60.

78. Vita Ampliata chapter 34, Scriptores 3 p 141.
79. Libellus de Diversis Ordinibus pp 34-7.
80. Liber, conclusion, Scriptores 1, p 60.
81. Leclercq, 'Le poème' p 78 1 34.
82. Smalley, 'Ecclesiastical attitudes' p 119.
83. *ibid* p 136.
84. Leclercq, 'Le poème' p 84 11 170-5.
85. Liber, prologue, Scriptores 1 pp 5-6.
86. See above, note 76.
87. Rule of St Benedict, ed and trans J. McCann (London, 1952) chapter 73.
88. PL 103 col 357.
89. 'Les relations entre le monachisme oriental et le monachisme occidental dans le haut moyen age', Le millenaire du Mont Athos 963 - 1963 2 vols (Chevetogne-Venice, 1963-5) 2 pp 49-80.
90. *ibid*.
91. Liber, chapter LXIII (1) Scriptores 1 p 33.
92. *ibid* (2).
93. *ibid* chapter XIII (1) p 17.
94. *ibid* (2); Life of Hugh of Lacerta chapter 4, Scriptores p 168.
See also chapter 9 pp 169-71: Hugh seems to have gone on pilgrimage to Jerusalem Christo militaturus - is this a reference to the First Crusade?
95. See, for example, the Life of William Firmat AASS April III p 334, where his mother uses the military vocabulary when talking of the religious life - si Regi tuo militare desideras - and the use of miles Christi as well as that of athleta Christi in the Life of

- Bernard of Tiron, AASS April II p 235. This area needs further investigation, but see also J. Leclercq, Monks and Love in Twelfth-Century France (Oxford, 1979) pp 94-95, p 88.
96. See the Life of Robert of Chaise-Dieu by Marbod of Rennes, PL 171 col 1509; the Life of Robert of Molesme AASS pp 669-76.
the Vita Prima of St Bernard, PL 185: col 257.
97. See Part I p 26 and note 76 above.
98. See B. Bolton, 'Fulk of Toulouse: the escape that failed', SCH 12 (1975) pp 83-93, note 86.
99. Colin Morris, 'Equestris Ordo: Chivalry as a vocation in the twelfth century', SCH 15 (1978) pp 87-96.
100. Orderic Vitalis, Ecclesiastical History, ed M. Chibnall vol VI (Oxford, 1978) p 240.
101. The mal des ardents (994) had also provided the opportunity for the church to proclaim a 'pact of peace and justice' between the warring nobles of the region. For both this and the council of 1031, see L. Guibert, 'Les évêques de Limoges et la paix sociale' BSAHL XLVII (1899) pp 36-50. The apostolicity of St Martial was proclaimed at the latter council.
102. See Fulcher of Chartres, Historia Hierosolymnitina, Receuil des Historiens des Croisades, Occidentaux vol 3 p 324.
103. For the disorders and guerres privées in the area, see J. Nouaillac, Histoire du Limousin et de la Marche (Paris, 1931). The major sources on the Limousin in the eleventh and twelfth centuries are Adhemar de Chabannes, Historia Libri tres part III para 16 ff. PL 141 cols 31-80; Bernard Ithier, Receuil des Historiens des Gaules et de la France vol XII pp 453-4; Geoffrey de Vigeois, Receuil, vol XII pp 421- 53 and vol XVIII pp 211-23.
104. See Nouaillac chapters Five and Six, pp 49-90 passim.
105. *ibid* p 54.
106. See Nouaillac chapter 6 pp 63-70 and, more recently, J. Gillingham, Richard the Lionheart (1978) pp 72-8 and pp 292-6.

107. For Raymond, see J. Becquet, 'Le mort d'un eveque de Périgueux a la premiere croisade', Bulletin de la Société archéologique et Historique de Périgord, LXXXVII (1960) pp 66-9. For Jauffré Rudel, see E. Hoepffner, Les Troubadours (Paris, 1955) pp 25-30. The Chanson d' Antioche is edited by Paulin (Paris, 1848).
108. Hoepffner, Troubadours pp 100-24.
109. Liber chapter LX (2) Scriptores 1 pp 31-2.
110. *ibid* (1).
111. J. Gilchrist, The Church and Economic Activity in the Middle Ages (London, 1969) p 165. For the problem of usury in general, see this work and also T. P. McLaughlin, 'The teaching of the canonists on usury', Medieval Studies 1 (1939) pp 81-143; 2 (1940) pp 1-11.
112. J. W. Baldwin, Masters, Princes and Merchants: the social views of Peter the Chanter and his Circle (2 vols, Princeton, 1970) 1, chapters 14 and 15, demonstrates the extent of the church's concern with usury and the extreme measures which it took against it.
113. J. T. Noonan, The Scholastic Analysis of Usury (Cambridge, Mass., 1957) p 32. For a usurer in southern France, see J. Mundy, 'Un usurier malheureux', Annales du Midi LXVIII no 33 (1965) pp 217-25.
114. Bolton, 'Fulk of Toulouse' pp 90-1.
115. *ibid*.
116. Geoffrey de Vigeois, Receuil, vol XVIII p 214.
117. See, J. J. Wilhelm, Seven Troubadours (Pennsylvania, 1970) pp 145-72, esp pp 160-4. For a complete edition of Bertrand's works, see A. Thomas, Poesies Complètes de Bertrand de Born (Toulouse, 1888).
118. Receuil vol XII pp 444-5.
(1-2)
119. Liber, chapter XLV/Scriptores 1 pp 26-7.
120. *ibid* XLVI (1) p 27.
XLVII (2)
121. *ibid* (2), pp 27-8.

122. ibid XLVIII (1) p 28.
123. ibid XLVII pp 27-8.
124. ibid XXXVII. (1) p 24.
125. cf. XXXVII (1) with LXII.
126. ibid XXXVIII p 24.
127. Rule chapter XXXVIII Scriptores 3 p 86.
128. R. Manselli, 'Il Valdismo Originario', Studi sulle eresie del secolo XII (Rome, 1975) pp 111-25.
129. Rule chapter XIV, Quod Deus in hac vita perseverantibus semper necessaria provideat, Scriptores 2 p 78.
130. Manselli, Eresie chapters V and VI pp 79-109. Both Peter and Henry believed in a church freed from worldly concerns and preached against the worship of God in wooden or stone buildings.
131. See B. Bolton, 'Paupertas Christi: Old Wealth and New Poverty in the Twelfth Century', SCH 14 (1977) pp 96 and 112.
132. PL 185 col 619; Life of Gerald de Sales, VSAC vol VI col 991.
133. See Guigo, Customs XX in M. Laporte, Aux Sources de la Vie Cartusienne (8 vols, La Grande Chartreuse, 1960-71) 4 pp 113 - 7.
134. I would suggest that the concept of poverty often had, where the new orders were concerned, a spiritual rather than a practical application and that the idea of relaxation of poverty is a distracting notion which can lead to unfruitful interpretations such as that of Leclercq (see Part I *passim*).
135. Liber chapter 1 ³(1) Scriptores 1 p 6.
136. Life chapter XXII, Scriptores 3 pp 116-7.
137. Life of Robert of Chaise-Dieu, PL 171 cols 512-3; Life of William Firmat, AASS April III pp 336-7.
138. See the Lives throughout, but particularly the chapters indicated

in note 137 above, and the Life of Robert of Arbrissel, PL 162 cols 1049-50.

139. Life of William Firmat, col 235 (9); Life of Gerard of Sales VSAC vol VI col 992.
140. Life of Bernard of Tiron, AASS April III pp 220 ff (chapters 52-4).
141. Liber Chapter LV, Scriptores 1 p 30.
142. *ibid* chapter XCII p 44; chapter XCIII p 45; chapter LXXVIII p 42.
143. For arguments in favour of the idea of a return to the sources in the twelfth century, see two interesting articles on the Cistercians: A. Dimier, 'Les concepts du moine et de la vie monastique chez les premiers cisterciens', Studia Monastica 1 (1959) pp 399-418, and J.-A. Lefèvre 'S Robert de Molesme dans l' opinion monastique du XII et XIII siècle', AB 74 (1956) pp 50-83. For Romuald's use of Cassian, see G. Tabacco, 'Romualdo di Ravenna e gli inizi dell' eremitismo Camaldolese', L' Eremitismo pp 93-5:

Romeualdo volle reformare la vita eremitica secondo le Collazioni, e che certo egli lesse e rilesse le Vitae patrum, prima fra tutte quella di Antonio. (p 93).

 See also C. Dereine, 'Odon de Tournai' p 143 and H. Bacht, 'La "loi de retour aux sources"', RM LI (1961).
 To judge by appearances, some historians only consider Basil when referring to eastern monasticism: see, for instance, B. Bolton, 'A mission to the orthodox? The Cistercians in Romania', SCH 13 (1976) p 174.
144. Life chapter XXII, Scriptores 3 pp 116-7.
145. See V. Lossky, The Mystical Theology of the Orthodox Church (London, 1951); K. Holl, Enthusiasmus und Bussgewalt beim griechischen Mönchtum. Eine Studie zu Symeon dem Neuen Theologen (Leipzig, 1898); John Climacus, Works PG LXXXVIII; Nicetas Stethatus, Works (especially Tres centuriae asceticae, Libellus contra Latinos) PG CXX; Vita Symeonis Junioris, ed I. Hausherr and G. Horn, Orientalia Christiana XII (Rome, 1928); A. Gardner, Theodore of Stoudium (London, 1905); M. Lot-Borodine, 'La Doctrine

de la "Deification" dans l' Eglise grecque jusqu' au XI siècle', Revue d' Histoire des Religions CV (1932) pp 5-43; CVI (1932) pp 525-74; CVII (1933) pp 8-55; Joan Hussey, Church and Learning in the Byzantine Empire 867-1185 (Oxford, 1937).

146. See, in particular, Lossky and Lot-Borodine for their treatment of this theme and its significance in the eastern church. I am not attempting to deny that the crucifix was represented in eastern churches - to take only two examples, the decoration of both Nea Moni and Hosios Loukas contains crucifixion scenes (see J. Beckwith, Early Christian and Byzantine Art (London, 1970) pp 234-5 and pp 230-1. However, these were not the dominant works in the churches but rather one of several scenes from the life of Christ, and could be so far reduced to their essentials that Beckwith (p 230) comments of the Hosios Loukas scene that it serves simply as a reminder of a liturgical feast. The difference, though, lies not in what was depicted but in the emphasis placed thereon.
147. The views of L.-R. Ménager must be mentioned here: see 'La "byzantinisation" religieuse de l' Italie Méridionale (IX-XI siècle) et la politique monastique des Normands d' Italie' RHE 53 (1958) pp 747-74; 54 (1959) pp 5-40. While his ideas seem to me to be exaggerated and probably untenable, perhaps we should nevertheless bear in mind some of his strictures about the situation of many of the Greek monasteries of Calabria in difficult and inaccessible places. For southern Italian monasticism in general and contacts with the Empire, see Gay, L' Italie méridionale pp 54-87; F. Chalandon, Histoire de la domination normande en Italie et Sicile II (Paris, 1907); K. Lake, 'The Greek monasteries in southern Italy' JTS IV (1903) pp 345-68 and 517-42; C. Korolewskij, 'Basiliens italo-grecs et espagnols', DHGE VI cols 1180-1236; M. Scaduto, Il monachesimo basiliano nella Sicilia medievale (Rome, 1947); T. Minisci, 'Riflessi studiti nel monachesimo italo-greco', Il monachesimo orientale (Orientalia christiana analecta 153) pp 215-53; S. Borsari, Il monachesimo bizantino in Sicilia e nell' Itali méridionale prenormanna (Naples, 1963); A. Guillou, Culture et société en Italie byzantine (London, 1978), nos V, VII, XI, XV, XVI; id., Studies on Byzantine Italy (London, 1970) nos XII and XIV; id., 'Il monachesimo greco in Italia meridionale e in Sicilia

- nel medioevo', L' Eremitismo pp 355-79; A. Pertusi, 'Aspetti organizzativi e culturali dell' ambiente monacale greco dell' Italia meridionale', L' Eremitismo pp 38e-426; id., 'Rapporti tra il monachesimo italo-greco ed il monachesimo bizantino nell' alto medioevo', La Chiesa greca in Italia dall VIII al XVI secolo vol II (Padua, 1973) pp 473-520.
148. For these interpretations, see Ménager, 'La "byzantinisation"; Judith Herrin, 'Aspects of the Process of re-Hellenisation in the early Middle Ages', Annual of the British School at Athens 68 (1973) p 122; and Guillou, Studies no XII.
149. Life of Elias the Speleot AASS September III pp 843 ff.
150. Life of Elias the Younger, AASS August III pp 479-509.
151. Life of Fantinus, AASS August VI, col 623.
152. Life of Nilus, AASS September VIII pp 282-342 (see also PG CXX).
153. Life of Bartholomew of Simeri, AASS September VIII pp 810-26. For the monastery of St Basil 'of the Calabrians' and that 'of the Sicilians' on Athos, see A. Pertusi, 'Monasteri e monaci italiani al-Athos nell' Alto Medioevo', Le Millenaire de Mont Athos I pp 234-7. (See also H. G. Beck, 'Die Benediktinerregel auf dem Athos', BZ 44 (1951) pp 21-6.
154. See Pertusi, 'Rapporti' esp pp 475-92 and Minisci, 'Riflessi' passim.
155. For this difficult and lately contentious question see E. Morini, 'Eremo e cenobio nel. monachesimo greco dell' Italia meridionale nei secoli IX e X', RSCI (1977) pp 1-39 and pp 354-90.
156. See Morini, Pertusi, Guillou passim. For a Life which refers to the Rule of Basil as the way of life followed by monks in southern Italy in the latter part of the eleventh century, see the Life of John Theristes, ed S. Borsari, Archivio Storico per la Calabria e la Lucania 22 (1953) pp 9 and 12 - but the saint himself appears to go into retreat in a cave, hence my questionmark over Pertusi's postulation of a more straightforwardly cenobitic life at this

period (see Pertusi, 'Rapporti' p 479 and note 1).

157. Pertusi, 'Rapporti' pp 480-91.

158. See Lake, 'Greek monasteries' pp 24-7; Pertusi, 'Aspetti organizzativi' pp 402-6; Guillou, Culture et Société no XIV; id. Studies nos XII and XV.

159. Pertusi, 'Rapporti' p 480.

160. See PG CXX cols 125-6.

161. See G. Thery, 'Scot Erigène, traducteur de Denys', Bulletin DuCange 6 (1931) pp 185-274.

162. Becquet, in particular, is capable of treating Grandmont and other aspects of the religious life of the area separately. See his valuable studies 'Les chanoines réguliers en Limousin aux XI et XII siècles', AP 36 (1960) pp 193-235; 'Aux origines du prieuré de l' Artige' BSAHL XC (1963) pp 85-100; 'Chanoines réguliers en Limousin au XII siècle: sanctuaires regularisés et dépendances étrangères', BSAHL CI (1974) pp 67-112; 'L' ordre de l' Artige' BSAHL XCVII (1970) pp 83-142; 'Les chanoines réguliers du Chalard' BSAHL XCVIII (1971) pp 153-71.

163. Life of Geoffrey of Le Chalard, ed, by A. Bosvieux, Memoires de la Société des Sciences Naturelles et Archéologiques de la Creuse III (1862) pp 75-160; Life of Gauthier de l' Esterps, PL 171 cols 1563-1576; Life of Gaucher d' Aureil MS Paris BN lat 10. 891 ff 79r - 88r; Life of Stephen of Obazine, ed Baluze, Miscellanea IV (Paris, 1683) pp 69-204.

164. See the Life, prologue. Becquet, 'L' érémitisme clerical et laic dans l'ouest de la France' L' Eremitismo pp 183-204 gives a very useful table of the dates of the lives of some of the best-known hermits of the area together with the date of the composition of their Lives. Out of a total of fourteen Lives, he finds three to be suspect - but that of Stephen of Muret is not among this group!

165. For Raymond, see note 107 above.

166. See Becquet, 'Les chanoines reguliers' p 207.

167. The version given by Marbod may be an abridgement of the earlier Life: see Becquet, 'Les chanoines réguliers' p 211.
168. Life cols 1566-74; col 1574.
169. Becquet, 'Les chanoines réguliers' pp 213-5.
170. See not only the Life but also G. Müller, 'Der Gründer der Abtei Obazine' Cistercienser-Chronik XL (1928) pp 241-6.
171. See the comments and bibliography given in A. Dimier, 'Etienne d' Obazine' DHGE 15 cols 1253-4.
172. For Dalon, see R. Limouzin-Lamothe, Le Diocèse de Limoges des Origines a la Fin du Moyen Age (Strasbourg-Paris, 1951) p 111.
173. Becquet, 'Aux origines' passim and Appendix II p 98.
174. Becquet, 'Les chanoines réguliers' pp 224-5.
175. *ibid* p 209.
176. See Becquet, 'Le coutumier des chanoines réguliers d' Aureil en Limousin au XIII siècle', BSAHL XCVIII (1971) pp 71-85.
177. There is a gap of some fifty years at least between the presumed date of Gaucher's death and the composition of the Life; see also note 179 below.
178. Life of Gaucher, f 80v.
179. *ibid* ff 86r and v; ff 83 r and v.
180. *ibid* ff 83 v.
181. A glance at any map of the area, or at Becquet's map, 'L' érémitisme clerical et laic' pp 203 shows that Aureil (canton. and arrondissement Limoges) was by far the nearest of the eremitical foundations to Muret and Grandmont.
182. Bernard Gui, Opuscula Historica, Labbe, Bibliotheca Nova MSS I p 638.

183. GC II Instrumenta col 198; Becquet, 'Les chanoines réguliers' gives it as 1090. The date of 1080 was first determined in the nineteenth century by the local historian and archivist Bosvieux, who takes considerable pains to determine the chronology of the foundation in a MS now preserved in the Archives Départementales at Limoges(5F Fonds Bosvieux K 15 f 40r-41r). The present church dates from the mid-twelfth century: according to an article in Limousin magazine no 172, May 1976, the original site of the monastery, Segundelas, was abandoned about 1105 (?) and a church, now under the present building was constructed. The visitor to Bénévent-l'-Abbaye can find the only traces of the second church by looking for the gap in the regular group of lime trees which adjoin the church!
184. GC II Instrumenta col 198 and Becquet, 'Les chanoines réguliers' p 208.
185. GC II Instrumenta col 198; Segundelas (Cigulet) is about 2 km away from the present site of Bénévent.
186. This is suggested by the remnants of the cartulary of Bénévent which survives in a partial copy by Bosvieux, Archives Départementales de la Creuse H 534 (of which there is also a copy in the Archives Départementales of Haute-Vienne).
187. Becquet, 'Les chanoines réguliers' p 208.
188. See Archives Départementales, Haute-Vienne, 5F Fonds Bosvieux, ff 22v-23r.
189. Eadmer, Historia Novorum in Anglia ed M. Rule, Rolls ser., LXXXI, p 94.
190. Monte Cassino Chronicle Book II chapter 16, PL 173 col 603.
191. Life of Gaucher f 81r.
192. See Becquet, 'La liturgie de l' ordre de Grandmont', Ephimerides Liturgicae LXXVI (1962) pp 146-61.
193. See Part Three (B) above.

194. See Guide du pèlerin de Saint-Jacques de Compostelle ed Vielliard, (Macon, 1937) pp 51-7.
195. For the canons of St Leonard of Noblat and the adoption of the Rule of St Augustine, see Becquet, 'Chanoines réguliers: sanctuaires regularisés'.
196. See the article on the cult of St Leonard and Bohemond's escape from the Turks, see AB 31, 'Bohemond et S. Léonard', pp 24-44.
197. See M. Oroux, Histoire de la Vie et la Culte de Saint Léonard du Limousin (Paris, 1746).
198. See BSAHL LXXVIII (1939-40) pp 93-4 for a discussion of the etymology of Mont Gargan.
199. A. von Harnack, Monasticism: its ideals and history (London, 1901) p 60.
200. H. G. Beck, Das Byzantinische Jahrtausend (1978) p 212.
201. Mahn, L' Ordre Cistercien p 26.
202. See the first and last chapters of the Rule of St Benedict.
203. See for example the Life of Geoffrey du Chalard for one good instance of this: a survey of all the Lives of eremitical saints of this period would certainly yield several similar examples.
204. See in particular C. J. Holdsworth, 'Christina of Markyate', Medieval Women (SCH Suqsidia 1) pp 185-204.
205. See note 143 above.
206. This Golden Letter was for a long time wrongly attributed to Bernard of Clairvaux, so see Charpentier, Oeuvres complètes de Saint Bernard (Paris, 1873) vol V p 325.
207. Life of Stephen of Muret, chapter VI, Scriptores 3 p 108.
208. Hamilton and McNulty, 'Orientale lumen' p 185.
209. *ibid* p 210.

210. See Olivier Rousseau, 'La visite de Nil de Rossano au Mont Cassin' La Chiesa Greca in Italian dall' VIII al XVI secolo vol III pp 1111-11 38, p 1114.
211. *ibid* p 1113.
212. *ibid* p 1114.
213. *ibid* pp 1116-1131.
214. See B. Hamilton, 'The monastery of S. Alessio and the religious and intellectual renaissance of tenth-century Rome', Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History II (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1965) pp 265-310, where the influence of Greek monks on Latin Christianity is postulated.
215. Il Ritmo Cassinese is printed in E. Monaci, Crestomazia (Rome, 1912) pp 17-9.
216. *ibid* p 18 11 28-30.
217. *ibid* p 18 11 45-7.
218. *ibid* p 18 11 48-53.
219. *ibid* p 19 1 71.
220. See L. Galdi, 'L' ideal ascétique byzantine et l'ancienne poesie italienne', Actes du VI Congrès International des Etudes Byzantines vol I (Paris, 1950) pp 231-238.
221. P. Brown, 'Eastern and Western Christendom in Late antiquity: a Parting of the Ways' SCH 13 (1976) p 5.
222. Vita Symeonis junioris ed. I. Hausherr and G. Horn, OC XII (1928) No. 45, and S. Runciman, The Eastern Schism (Oxford, 1955).
223. A. Bryer, 'Cultural relations between east and west in the twelfth century', Relations Between East and West in the Middle Ages, ed. D. Baker, Edinburgh, 1973) p 90.

S. Lowenfeld, F. Kaltenbrunner, P. Ewald, (2 vols, Berlin, (1885-8)

MANSI

Sacrorum Conciliorum . . . amplissima collectio, ed J. Mansi, new impression and continuation ed. Petit and Martin (Paris, 1899-1927)

MGH SS

Monumenta Germaniae Historica (Berlin/Hanover, 1826-)
Scriptores

PG

Patrologia Graeca ed J. P. Migne (Paris, 1857-66)

PL

Patrologia Latina ed J. P. Migne (Paris, 1841-64)

QFIAB

Quellen und Forschungen aus Italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken (Rome, 1897-)

RB

Revue Bénédictine (Maredsous, 1884-)

RHE

Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique (Louvain, 1900-)

RISS

Rerum Italicarum Scriptores ed L. A. Muratori (Milan, 1723-51)

RM

Revue Mabillon (Paris 1905-)

RSCI

Rivista di Storia della Chiesa in Italia (Rome, 1947-)

SCH

Studies in Church History (London, 1964-)

SCRIPTORES
1,2,3

Liber de Doctrina, Regula, Vita Stephanis, ed Becquet in Scriptores Ordinis Grandimontensis (Turnhout 1968) pp 3-62; 63-99; 100-164

SM

Studi Medievali (Spoleto, 1904-)

TNA

Thesaurus Novum Anecdotorum ed Martène and Durand (Paris 1717)

TRHS

Transactions of the Royal Historical Society (London, 1871-)

VSAC

Veterum Scriptorum et Monumentorum Historicorum, Dogmaticorum, Moraliu Amplissima Collectio ed Martène and Durand (Paris, 1729)

Primary Sources Cited in the Text

- Adhémar de Chabannes Historia Libri Tres PL 141 cols 19-80
- Becquet, J. ed. Scriptores Ordinis Grandimontensis, Corpus Christianorum (Continuatio Medievalis VIII)
(Turnhout, 1963)
- Camobreco, R. ed. Regesto di San Leonardo di Siponto (Istituto Storico Italiano - Istituto Storico Prussiano (Regesta Chartarum Italiae 10) (Rome, 1913)
- Cistercians and Cluniacs : the Case for Cîteaux (Cistercian Fathers Series no 33) (Kalamazoo, 1977)
- Climacus, John Works PG 87
- Gnesser, B. ed. Exordium Magnum Cistercense Sive Narratio de Initio Cistercensis (Rome, 1961)
- Eadmer Historia Novorum in Anglia ed., M. Rule
(Rolls Series LXXXI) (London, 1884)
- Falco of Benevento Chronicon PL 173 cols 1149-1260
- Fulcher of Chartres Historia Hierosolymita, Recueil des Historiens des Croisades, Occidentaux vol 3
- Gallia Christiana vol II (2nd ed., Paris 1873) and
vol VIII (1st ed., Paris 1774)
- Geoffroy de Vigetis Chronicle, Recueil des Historiens des Gaules et de la France vols XII pp 421-53 and XVIII
pp 211-23
- Gerald of Wales Speculum Ecclesiae in Opera IV ed., J. Brewer,
J. F. Dimock, and G. F. Warner (Rolls Series,
London 1861-91)
- Idung Dialogus Duorum Monachorum TNA vol V (1717)
cols 1569-1645

- Inguanez, M. ed. I Necrologi Cassinesi I : Il necrologio del Cod. Cassinese 4) (Fonti per la storia d'Italia 83) (Rome, 1947)
- John Climacus Opera PG 87
- Kehr, P. Italia Pontificia vols 8 and 9 (Berlin, etc 1906-75)
- Leo of Ostia (attrib.) Narratio de consecratione et dedicatione ecclesiae casinensis PL 173 cols 997-1002
- Leo of Ostia and Peter the Deacon Chronicon Casinensis PL 173 cols 440-990
- Life of Bernard of Tiron PL 172 cols 1363-1446
- Life of Elias the Speleot AASS September III pp 843ff
- Life of Elias the Younger AASS August III pp 479-509
- Life of Fantinus AASS August VI p 623
- Life of Gaucher of Aureil MS Paris BN lat 10. 891 ff 79 -88
- Life of Gauthier of L'Esterps PL 171 cols 1563-76
- Life of Geoffrey of le Chalard ed. A. Bosvieux, Memoires de la Société des Sciences Naturelles et Archéologiques de la Creuse III (1862) pp 75-160
- Life of Gerald of Salles VSAC VI cols 989-1014
- Life of John Theristes ed., S. Borsari, Archivio Storico per la Calabria e la Lucania 22 (1953) pp 136-151
- Life of Nilus the Younger AASS September VIII pp 282-342 and PG CXX cols 1-166
- Life of Robert of Arbrissel PL 162 cols 1043-58
- Life of Robert of Chaise-Dieu PL 171 cols 1515-32
- Life of Robert of Molesme AASS April III pp 669-76
- Life of Stephen of Obazine ed., Baluze, Miscellanea IV (Paris, 1683) pp 69-204
- Life of William Firmat AASS April III pp 334-42
- Life of Vital of Savigny ed., E. Sauvage AB I (1882) pp 357-90

- Liutprand of Cremona Works ed. and trans E. A. Wright (London 1930)
- Petrucci, A. ed. Codice diplomatico del monastero benedettino di S. Maria di Tremiti 1005-1237 (Istituto Storico Italiano: Fonti per la Storia d'Italia 98) (3 vols Rome, 1960)
- Orderic Vitalis Ecclesiastical History ed., M. Chibnall vols 4 (Oxford, 1973) and 6 (Oxford, 1978)
- Peter Damian De fuga dignitatum ecclesiasticarum PL 145 cols 457-60
- Peter Damian Vita Beati Romualdi ed. G. Tabacco (Fonti per la Storia d'Italia, 94) (Rome, 1957)
- Prou, M. Receuil des Actes de Philippe Ier (Paris, 1907)
- Robertson, J. Materials for the History of Archbishop Thomas Becket vols 6 and 7 (Rolls Series London 1882-5)
- Rogers, R. H. ed. Petri Diaconi Ortus et Vita Iustorum Cenobii Casinensis (Berkely, 1972)
- Stethatus, Nicetas Works PG 120 and Vita Symeonis ed., I. Hausherr and G. Horn, Orientalia Christiana XII (Rome, 1928)
- Symeon the Younger Orationes PG 120 cols 321-503
- Trinchera, F. Syllabus Graecarum Membranarum (Naples, 1865)
- Ughelli, F. Italia Sacra vols VIII, IX, X (2nd ed. Coleti, Venice, 1721-2)

Secondary Works Cited in the Text

- Bacht, H. 'La "loi de retour aux sources"', RM L1 (1961).
- Baker, D. ed. Relations Between East and West in the Middle Ages (Edinburgh, 1973).
-'San Bernardo e l' Elezione di York!', Studi su S. Bernardo di Chiaravalle nell'ottavo centenario della canonizzazione (Bibliotheca Cistercensis 6) (Rome, 1975).
-'Reform as protest: The evidence of western eremitical movements', The Church in a Changing Society (Uppsala, 1977) pp 55-62.
-'Popular piety in the Lodèvois in the early twelfth century: the case of Pons de Lèras', SCH 15 (1978) pp 39-47.
-'Crossroads and crises in the religious life of the late eleventh century', SCH 16 (1979) pp 137-48.
- Baldwin, J. W. Masters, Princes, and Merchants: the Social Views of Peter the Chanter and His Circle (2 vols, Princeton, 1970).
- Bartoloni, F. 'Note di diplomatico vescovile beneventana' (Part 1), Rendiconti dell' accademia dei Lincei, classe di scienze morali, ser VIII vol V (1950) pp 425 ff.
- Beck, H-G. Das Byzantinisches Jahrtausend (Berlin, 1977).
- Beckwith, J. Early Christian and Byzantine Art (London, 1970).
- Becquet, J. 'Les institutions de l'Ordre de Grandmont au Moyen Age' RM XLII (1952).
-'Les premiers écrivains de l'Ordre de Grandmont' RM XLIII (1953) pp 121-37.
-'Etienne de Muret' DHGE vol 15 cols 1252-3.
-'L'"institution", premier coutumier de l'Ordre de Grandmont' BSAHL XLVI (1956) pp 15-32.
-'Saint Etienne de Muret et l' archevêque de Benevent Milon' BSAHL LXXXVI (1957) pp 403-9.
-'La règle de Grandmont' BSAHL LXXXVII (1958-60) pp 9-36.
-'La première crise de l'Ordre de Grandmont', BSAHL LXXXVII (1958-60) pp 283-324.
-'La bullaire de Grandmont', RM XLVI pp 34-91.
-'Le mort d'un eveque de Périgueux a la première Croisade', Bulletin de la Societe Archeologique et Historique de Périgord LXXXVII (1960) pp 66-9.
-'Les chanoines réguliers en Limousin aux XI et XII siècles' AP 36 (1960) pp 193-235.

-'Etienne de Muret', DS IV (1961) cols 1504-14.
-'La liturgie de l'Ordre de Grandmont', Ephimerides Liturgicae LXXVI (1962) pp 146-161.
-'Bibliothèque des écrivains de l'Ordre de Grandmont', RM LIII (1963) pp 59-69.
-'Aux origines du prieuré de l'Artige', BSAHL XC (1963) pp 85-100.
-'Le coutumier des chanoines réguliers d' Aureil', BSAHL XCI (1964) pp 71-85.
-'L'ordre d' Artige', BSAHL XCVII (1970) pp 83-142.
- Benedictines of St Augustine's, Ramsgate. The Book of Saints (London, 1966).
- Bertolini, G. 'Gli Annales Beneventani', BISIMEAM 42 (1923) pp 1-163.
-'I documenti trascritti nel "Liber Praeceptorum Beneventani Monasterii S. Sophiae"', Studi in Onore di Michelangelo Schipa (Naples, 1926) pp 11-47.
- Bligny, B. Receuil des plus anciens actes de la Grande Chartreuse (1086-1196) (Grenoble, 1958).
-'Les premiers Chartreux et la pauvreté', Le Moyen Age 57 (1951) pp 27-60.
-'Un aspect de la vie religieuse au moyen age. La concurrence monastique dans les Alpes au XII siècle', Bulletin philologique et historique du comite des Travaux Historiques et Scientifiques (1951-2) pp 279-87.
- Bollandists, Society of. Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca (2nd ed., Brussels, 1909).
- Bolton, B. 'Fulk of Toulouse: the escape that failed', SCH 12 (1975) pp 83-93.
-'A mission to the orthodox? The Cistercians in Romania', SCH 13 (1976) pp 169-181.
-'Paupertas Christi: Old Wealth and New Poverty in the Twelfth Century', SCH 14 (1977) pp 95-103.
- Bonnes, J-B. 'Un des plus grands predicateurs du XII siècle, Geoffroy de Loroux', RB XLVI (1945) pp 190-200.
- Borgia, S. Memorie Istoriche della Pontifiche Città di Benevento (3 vols, Rome, 1763-9).
- Borgia, S. Breve Istoria del dominio temporale della Sede Apostolica nelle due Sicilie (Rome, 1788).
- Borsari, S. Il monachesimo bizantino in Sicilia e nell' Italia meridionale prenormanna (Naples, 1963).
- Bredero, A. 'Cluny et Cîteaux au XII siècle : les origines de la controverse', SM 3rd ser 12 (1971).

-'Pierre le Vénérable: les commencements de son abbatiat à Cluny (1122-32)' Pierre Abélard, Pierre le Vénérable (Colloques Internationaux du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique n. 546) (Paris, 1975) pp 99-118.
-'A propos de l'autorité abbatiale de Pons de Melgueil et Pierre le Vénérable', Etudes de civilisation médiévale: Mélanges offerts à E. R. Laloude (Poitiers, 1975).
- Brown, P. 'Eastern and Western Christendom in Late Antiquity: a Parting of the Ways', SCH 13 (1976) pp 1-24.
- Buhot, J. 'L'abbaye normande de Savigny, chef d'ordre et fille de Cîteaux', Le Moyen Age 3rd series, 8 (1936) pp 1-20.
- Cantor, N. 'The crisis of monasticism 1050-1130', AHR 66 (1960) pp 47-67.
- Capasso, B. Le fonti della storia delle provincie Napoletane dal 568-1500 (Naples, 1902).
- Capitani, O. 'San Pier Damiani e l'istituto eremitico', L'Eremitismo pp 122-63.
- Caspar, E. Petrus Diaconus und die Monte Cassineser Fälschungen (Berlin, 1909).
- Chalandon, F. Histoire de la domination normande en Italie et Sicile vol II (Paris, 1907).
- Charanis, P. 'Nikephoros I, the saviour of Greece from the Slavs', Byzantina - Metabyzantina I (1946) pp 75-92.
- Chenu, M.-D. La Théologie au Douzième Siècle (Paris, 1957).
- Ciarlanti, G. V. Memorie Istoriche del Sannio (3 vols, Isernia, 1644).
- Colker, M. L. 'Fulcoii Belvacensis Epistolae', Traditio X (1954) pp 191-273.
- Constable, G. Monastic Tithes from their Origins to the Twelfth Century (Cambridge, 1964).
- Constable, G. and Smith, B., ed. Libellus de Diversis Ordinibus et Professionibus qui sunt in Ecclesia (Oxford, 1972).
- Constable, G. 'The disputed election at Langres in 1138', Traditio XIII (1957) pp 119-52.
-'Cluniac Tithes and the Controversy between Gigny and Le Miroir' RB LXX (1960) pp 591-624.
-'St Bernard and the Diversity of Forms of the Religious Life in the Twelfth Century', Studi su San Bernardo di Chiaravalle

- Bibliotheca Cistercensis 6 (Rome, 1975) pp 93-114.
-'The monastic policy of Peter the Venerable', Pierre Abélard, Pierre le Vénérable, (Colloques Internationaux du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique no 566) (Paris, 1975) pp 119-142.
- Delaruelle, E. 'La pietà popolare nel secolo XI', Relazioni del X Congresso internazionale di Scienze Storiche IV : Storia del Medioevo (Florence, 1955).
- Delehaye, H. Cinq leçons sur la methode hagiographique (Brussels, 1934).
- Delisle, L. 'Examen de treize chartes de l'Ordre de Grandmont', Memoires de la Societe des Antiquaires de Normandie XX (1854) pp 171-221.
- Dereine, C. 'Vie commune, règle de Saint Augustine, et chanoines réguliers au XI siecle', RHE XLI (1946) pp 365-406.
-'Odon de Tournai et la crise du cénobitisme au XI siècle', Revue du Moyen Age Latin IV (2) 1948.
-'L' obituaire primitif de l' Ordre de Grandmont', BSAHL LXXXVII (1958-60? pp 325-31.
-'Les concepts du moine et de la vie monastique chez les premiers cisterciens', Studia Monastica I (1959) pp 399-418.
-'La spiritualité "apostolique" des premiers fondateurs d' Affligem', RHE LIV (1959) pp 41-65.
- Dickinson, J. C. The Origins of the Austin Canons (London, 1950).
- Dimier, A. 'S. Bernard et le droit en matière de transitus', RM XLIII (1953).
-'Etienne d' Obazine', DHGE vol 15 cols 1253-4.
- Ehre, F. 'Zur Geschichte der Katalogierung der Vaticana' HJ XI (1890) pp 718 ff.
- Evans, J. Monastic Life at Cluny (Oxford, 1931).
- von Falkenhausen, V. 'Taranto in epoca bizantina', SM 3rd ser., 9 (1966) pp 135-56.
- Fliche and Martin. Histoire de l' Eglise vols 8 and 9 (Paris, 1946 1953).
- Fremon, Ch. La vie et les enseignements de Saint Etienne, fondateur de l' Ordre de Grandmont (Dijon, 1647).
- Gaborit, J.-R. L' architecture de l' Ordre de Grandmont, unpublished Thesis (Paris, 1963).

Gardner, Alice. Theodore of Studium (London, 1906).

Gay, J. L' Italie Méridionale et l' Empire Byzantin Depuis l' Avenement de Basile I jusqu' a la Prise de Bari par les Normandes (867-1071) (Paris, 1904).

.....'La monastere de S. Maria di Tremiti d'après un cartulaire inedit', Mélanges d' archeologie et d' histoire X VII (1897) pp 387 ff.

Giannelli, B. Discorso quale si prova che 'l corpo di S. Bartholomeo apostolo sia in Benevento (Benevento, 1695).

Gilchrist, J. The Church and Economic Activity in the Middle Ages (London, 1969).

Gillingham, J. Richard the Lionheart (London, 1978).

Girgensohn, D. 'Dall episcopato greco all' episcopato latino nell' Italia méridionale', La Chiesa Greca in Italia dal VIII al XVI secolo I (Padua, 1973) pp 25-44.

Grundmann, H. Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter (2nd ed., Hildesheim, 1961).

Guibert, L. Destruction de l' Ordre de Grandmont (Limoges, 1877).

.....'L' Ecole monastique d'orfèvrerie de Grandmont', BSAHL XXXVI (1889) pp 51-98.

.....'Les evêques de Limoges et la paix sociale', BSAHL XLVIII (1899) pp 36-50.

Guillou, A. Studies on Byzantine Italy (London, 1970).

.....Culture et societe en Italie Byzantine (VI-XI Siecles) (London, 1978).

.....'La Lucanie Byzantine', B 35 (1965) pp 119-49.

.....'L' Italia bizantine', BISIMEAM 78 (1967) pp 1-20.

.....'Il monachesimo greco in Italia méridionale e in Sicilia nel Medioevo', L' Eremitismo pp 355-79.

Hallam, E. 'Henry II, Richard I and the Order of Grandmont', Journal of Medieval History I (1975) pp 165-87.

Hamilton, B. 'S. Pierre Damien et les mouvements monastique de son temps', Studi Gregoriani X (Rome, 1975) pp 175-202.

Hamilton, B. and McNulty, P. 'Orientale lumen et magistra latinitas: Greek influences on western monasticism (900-1100)', Le Millenaire de Mont Athos (963-1963) vol I (Chevetogne, 1963).

Harnack, A. Monasticism: its Ideals and History (English version, London 1901).

Hausherr, I., and Horn, G. 'Un Grand Mystique Byzantin. Vie de Symeon le Nouveau Théologien par Nicetas Stethatos', OC XII (1928):.

Hay, D. Annalists and Historians (London, 1977).

Herde, P. 'Il papato e la chiesa greca', La Chiesa Greca in Italia dal VIII al XVI Secolo I (Padua, 1973)

Hoepffner, E. Les Troubadours (Paris, 1955).

Hoffmann, E. 'Die Entwicklung der Wirtschaftsprinzipien im Cistercienserorden während des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts', Historisches Jahrbuch XXI (1910) pp 700 ff.

Hoffmann, H. 'Studien zur Chronik von Montecassino', DA 29 (1973) pp 54-162.

Holdsworth, C. 'Christina of Markyate', Medieval Women (SCH Subsidia 1, London 1978) pp 185-204.

.....'A Cistercian monastery and its neighbours', History Today 30 (1980) viii p 32-7.

Holl, K. Enthusiasmus und Bussgewalt beim griechen Mönchtum. Eine Studie zu Symeon deus Neuen Theologen (Leipzig, 1898).

Huygens, K. 'Le moine Idung et ses deux ouvrages', SM XIII pp 219-470.

Huyghebaert, N. 'Moines et Clercs Italiens en Lotharingie', Annales du 33 congrès de la Fédération Archeologique et Historique de Belgique (Tournai, 1951) p 95-111.

Hussey, J. Church and Learning in the Byzantine Empire 867-1115 (London, 1937).

Kehr, P.F. Italia Pontificia vols 8 and 9 (Berlin 1961 and 1962).

Kemp, E. W. 'Pope Alexander III and the Canonisation of Saints', Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 4th Series XXVII (1945) pp 13-28.

Klewitz, H. W. 'Zur Geschichte der Bistumsorganisation Campaniens und Apuliens im 10 und 11 Jahrhundert', QFIAB XXIV (1923-4) pp 1-61.

Knowles, D. The Monastic Order in England (2nd ed, London, 1950).

.....Cistercians and Cluniacs (London, 1955).

- Knowles, D., and Hadcock, R. Medieval Religious Houses in England and Wales (London, 1953).
- Korolewskij, C. 'Basiliens Italo-grecs et Espagnols', DHGE VI (Paris, 1932) cols 1180-1236.
- Lake, K. The Early Days of Monasticism on Mount Athos (Oxford, 1909).
- Lanzoni, F. Le diocesi d' Italia (Studi e testi 35, Rome 1960).
- Laporte, M. Aux sources de la vie cartusienne (8 vols, La Grand Chartreuse, 1960-71).
- Lecler, A. 'Histoire de l' Ordre de Grandmont', BSAHL LVIII (1907) pp 129-71.
- Leclercq, J. S. Pierre Damien, ermite et homme d'église (Rome, 1960).
-'Une ancienne rédaction des coutumes cisterciennes', RHE XLVII (1952) pp 172-6.
-'Passage supprimé dans un épître d'Alexandre III', RB 62 (1952) pp 149-51.
-'Epître d'Alexandre III sur les cisterciens', RB 64 (1954).
-'La crise du monachisme au XI et XII siècles', BISIMEAM 70 (1958) pp 19-41.
-'L' Exordium Cistercii et la Summa Cartae Caritatis sont-ils de S. Bernard?', RB 73 (1963) pp 89-99.
-'Les relations entre le monachisme occidental et le monachisme occidental dans le haut moyen age', Le Millenaire du Mont Athos, 963-1963 (2 vols Chevetogne - Venice 1963-5) vol 2 pp 53-64.
-'Le poème de Payen Bolotin contre les Faux Ermites', RB 68 (1968) pp 52-36.
- Leclercq, J., Bredero, A., Zerbi, P. 'Encore sur Pons de Cluny et Pierre le Vénérable', Aevum XLVIII (1974) pp 139-49.
- Leclercq, J., and Bonnes, J.-P. Jean de Fécamp: un maître de la vie spirituelle au XI siècle, (Paris, 1946).
- Lecomte, M. 'La publication des "Annales Ordinis Sancti Benedicti" Mélanges et documents publiés à l'occasion du 2 centenaire de la mort de Mabillon (Archives de la France Monastique, Paris 1908) pp 253-78.
- Lefèvre, J.-A. 'Le vrai récit des origines de Cîteaux, est-il l' Exordium Parvum?', Le Moyen Age LXI (1955) pp 70-120, 329-61.

-'S. Robert de Molesme dans l'opinion monastique du XII et du XIII siècle', AB 74 (1956) pp 50-83.
-'Que savons-nous du Cîteaux primitif?' RHE LI (1956) pp 5-41.
- Lekai, L. J. The Cistercians (Kent State, 1977).
- Levesque, J. Annales Ordinis Grandimontensis (Trier, 1662).
- Limouzin-Lamothe, R. Le diocèse de Limoges des origines a la fin du moyen age (Strasbourg - Paris, 1951).
- Lobineau, A. Histoire de Bretagne 2 vols (Paris, 1707).
- Lohrmann, D. 'Roffrid von Montecassino oder Erzbischof Roffrid von Benevent?' QFIAB 47 (1967) pp 630-40.
- Lossky, V. The Mystical Theology of the Orthodox Church (London, 1951).
- Lot-Borodine, M. 'La doctrine de la "deification" dans l'Eglise grecque' RHR CV (1932) pp 5-43; CVI (1932) pp 525-74; CVIII (1933) pp 8-55.
- Lowe, E. A. The Beneventan Script (Oxford, 1914).
-Scriptura Beneventana II (Oxford, 1929).
-'Die Ältesten Kalendarien aus Monte Cassino', Quellen und Untersuchungen zur Lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters III 3 (1908).
- McDonnell, E. W. 'The Vita Apostolica: Diversity or Dissant', Church History 24 (1955) pp 15-31.
- McLaughlin, T. P. 'The teaching of the canonists on usury', Medieval Studies 1 (1939) pp 81-143; 2 (1940) pp 1-22.
- Mabillon, J. De re diplomatica (2 vols Paris, 1681 and 1704).
-Acta Sanctorum Ordinis Sancti Benedicti (Paris, 1663-1701).
-Annales Ordinis Sancti Benedicti (2nd ed, Paris 1739-45).
- Mahn, J-B. L' Ordre Cistercien et son Gouvernement des Origines au milieu du XIII siècle (1098-1265) (2nd ed, Paris, 1951).
- Manselli, R. Studi sulle eresie del secolo XII (Rome, 1975).
- de la Marche de Parnac, H. Lettre critique d'un religieux de Grandmont a un de ses confreres sur le livre intitulé Les Moines Empruntez (Paris, 1697).
-La Vie de S. Etienne, Fondateur de l'Ordre de Grandmont (2 vols Paris 1704 and 1712).

- Marchgaye, P. 'Chartes normandes de l'abbaye de S. Florent', Memoires de la Societe des Antiquaires de Normandie, 3rd Ser. 10 (Caen, 1880).
- Menager, L. R. 'La "Byzantinisation" religieuse d' Italie meridionale (XI-XII siècle) et la politique monastique des Normands d' Italie' RHE LIII (1938) pp 747-74 and LIV (1959) pp 5-40.
- de Meyer, A. and de Smet, J. Guigo's "Consuetudines" van die eerste Kartuziens (Brussels, 1951).
- Meyer, W. 'Zwei Eedichte zur Geschichte des Cistercienser Ordens', Nachrichten der Königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Klasse (1908) pp 386-95.
- Miccoli, G. 'Théologie de la vie monastique chez S. Pierre Damien', Théologie de la vie monastique (Paris, 1961).
- Minisci, T. 'I Typika liturgi ci dell' Italia bizantina', Bolletino della Badia Greca di Grottaferrata, 7 (1953) pp 97-104.
- Monaci, E. Crestomazia (Rome, 1912).
- Moore, R. I. The Birth of European Dissent (London, 1975).
- Morice, H. Mémoires pour servir de Preuves a l' Histoire de Bretagne vol I (Paris, 1742).
- Morris, C. 'Equestri Ordo: Chivalry as a vocation in the twelfth century', SCH 15 (1978) pp 87-96.
- Mouraux, A. 'La vie apostolique à propos de Rupert de Deutz', Revue Liturgique et Monastique XXI (1931) pp 71-8, 125-41.
- Müller, G. 'Der Gründer der Abtei Obazine', Cistercienser-Chronik XL (1928) pp 241-6.
- Mundy, J. 'Un usurier malheureux', Annales du Midi LXVIII no. 33 (1965) pp 217-35.
- Murray, A. Reason and Society in the Middle Ages (London, 1978).
.....'Pope Gregory VII and His Letters', Traditio XXII (1966) pp 149-202.
- Nadaud, J. Pouillé du Diocese de Limoges (Limoges, 1903 = BSAHL vol LII).
- Noonan, J. T. The Scholastic Analysis of Usury (Cambridge, Mass., 1957).
- Nouaillac, J. Histoire du Limousin et de la Marche (Paris, 1931).

Pardoux de la Garde, H. Antiquitez de Grandmont (Paris, 1654).

Pertusi, A. 'Rapporti tra il monachesimo italo-greco ed il monachesimo bizantino nell' alto medioevo', La Chiesa Greca in Italia dal VIII al XVI secolo II (Padua, 1963) pp 473-520.

.....'Aspetti organizzativi e culturali dell' ambiente monacale greco dell' Italia meridionale', L' Eremitismo pp 382-426.

Poncelet, A. 'Bohemond et S. Léonard', AB 31 pp 21-4.

Poupardin, R. Etudes sur l'histoire des principautés Lombardes de L' Italie méridionale (Paris, 1907).

.....'Etude sur la diplomatie des princes lombardes de Bénévent, de Capua, et de Salèrne', MAH XXI (1901) pp 115-80.

Pratesi, A. 'Note di diplomatico vescovile beneventana', Bulletino del Paleografico Italiano n.s. vol I (1965) pp 19-91.

Rotili, M. 'La chiesa di S. Ilario a Porta Aurea', Atti del III Congresso di Studi sull' Alto Medioevo (Spoleto, 1959) pp 525 ff.

Runciman, S. The Eastern Schism (Oxford, 1955).

Sarnelli, P. Memorie chronologiche de' vescovi ed arcivescovi della s. chiesa di Benevento (Naples, 1691).

Scaduto, M. Il monachesimo basiliano nella Sicilia medievale, Rinascita e decadenza XI-XIV secolo (Rome, 1947).

Smalley, B. 'Ecclesiastical attitudes to novelty c.1100-c.1250' SCH 12 (1975) pp 113-31.

Smidt, W. Das Chronicon Beneventani Monasterii Sanctae Sophiae (Berlin, 1910).

Smith, J. 'Robert of Arbrissel: Procurator Mulierum', SCH Subsidia I, Medieval Women (London, 1978) pp 175-84.

Tabacco, G. 'Romualdo di Ravenna e gli inizi dell' eremitismo camaldolese', L' eremitismo pp 73-121.

Tellenbach, G., ed. Neue Forschungen über Cluny und die Cluniacenser von Joachim Wollasch, Hans-Erich Meyer und Hermann Dreuer (Freiburg, 1959).

.....'Die sturz des Abtes Pontius', OFIAB XLII-III (1964) pp 13-55.

Thomas, A. Les poésies completes de Bertrand de Born (Toulouse, 1888).

Turk, J. 'Cistercii statuta antiquissima', Anaclea Sacri Ordinis Cisterciensis A (1948) pp 1-59.

Vehse, O. 'Benevent als Territorium des Kirchenstaates bis zum Beginn der Avignoniensen Epoche', OFIAB 22 (1930-31) pp 87 ff.

- Viard, P. Histoire de la dîme ecclésiastique principalement en France, jusqu' au Decret de Gratien (Dijon, 1909).
- Vicaire, M-H. L' imitation des apôtres: moines, chanoines, mendiants (IV-XIII siècles) (Paris, 1963).
- Vincent of Beauvais. Speculum Historiale (Venice, 1591).
- di Vipera, M. Chronologia Episcoporum Beneventarum (Naples, 1638).
-Catalogus Sanctorum Beneventarum (Naples, 1635).
- di Vita, G. Archiepiscopatus Beneventani nec non archiepiscopatum, episcopatum inferiorumque regni Neapoli beneficorum libertas vindicata (n.p. 1738).
- Voigt, K. Beiträge zur Diplomatik der langobardischen Fürsten von Benevent, Capua und Salerno' (Göttingen, 1902).
-Die königlichen Eigenklöster in Langobardenreiche (Gotha, 1909).
- von Walter, J. Die Erste Wanderprediger Frankreichs (2 vols, Leipzig 1903 and 1906).
- Werner, E. Pauperes Christi. Studien zu Sozial-Religiöse Bewegungen im Zeitalter des Reformpapsttums (Leipzig, 1956).
-'Neue Texte und Forschungen zur Charta Charitatis', Forschungen und Fortschritte 29 (1955) pp 25-9.
- White, H. V. 'Pontius of Cluny, the Curia Romana and the End of Gregorianism in Rome', Church History XXVII (1958) pp 195-219.
- White, L. T. Latin Monasticism in Norman Sicily (Cambridge, Mass., 1938).
- Wilhelm, J. Seven Troubadours (Pennsylvania, 1970).
- Williams, J. R. 'Archbishop Manasses of Rheims and Pope Gregory VII' AHR 54 (1949) pp 804-24.
- Wilmart, A. 'Deux lettres concernant Raoul le Verd, l'ami de S. Bruno', RB 51 (1931).
- Wollasch, J. 'Neue Quellen zur Geschichte der Cistercienser' Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte LXXXIV (1973) pp 188-232.
- Zerbi, P. 'Intorno alla schisma di Ponzio, abate di Cluny', Studi Storici in onore di Ottorino Bertolini (Pisa, 1972) pp 835-91.

Addenda and Corrigenda

Addenda to Bibliography of Secondary Works

- Beck, H. G. 'Die Benediktenerregel auf dem Athos', BZ 44 (1951) pp 21-6
- Becquet, J. 'L'erémisme clerical et laic dans l'ouest de France'
L'Eremitismo
- Bertolini, O. 'La collezione canonica del Vat Lat 4939',
Collectanea Vaticana in nonorem Anselmi M. Card. Albareda
(Studi e Testi 219, Rome, 1961)
- Hamilton, B. 'The Monastery of S. Alessio and the religious and intellectual renaissance in tenth century Rome', Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History, II (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1965) pp 265-310
- Leccisotti, T. 'Le relazioni fra Montecassino e Tremiti e i possedimenti a Foggia e Lucera', Benedictina III (1949) pp 203 ff
- Morini, E. 'Eremo e cenobio nel monachesimo greco dell' Italia meridionale nei secoli IX e X' RSCI (1972) pp 1-39, 354-90.
- Pertusi, A. 'Monasteri e monaci Italiani al Athos nel Alto Medioevo', Le Millenaire de Mont Athos I (1963) pp 234-7.
- Thery, G. 'Scot Erigène, traducteur de Denys', Bulletin DuDange 6 (1931) pp 185-274.

P. 147: footnote 151a has been omitted and should read:

VL 4939 ff 168r - 170r.